The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CIX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1919 No. 2829

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 385

EDITORIALS:

Shantung and the Senate 388
A Resignation Not Yet Written by Robert Lansing 389
The Forces of Disorder 390
Mr. Salteena 391
The Chorus Girl Irredenta 391

LO! THE POOR PROFESSOR. By John W. Bradford 392

BUSINESS AND THE CHURCH. Correspondence between Ralph M. Easley and William Fellowes Morgan 393

MEXICO'S FUTURE. By L. J. de Bekker 395

THE MOST CONTEMPLATIVE MAN'S RECREATION. By Robert P. Utter 396

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:

The Settlement of Ireland. By Herbert W. Horwill 398

CHINESE DRAWINGS. By Witter Bynner 399

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 399

CORRESPONDENCE 400

LITERATURE:

The Tasks of Reconstruction 401
Feudal Quakers 403
Chinese Lore 404
Tales of Plain People 404

BOOKS IN BRIEF 405

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 407

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 409

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY

MIRIAM R. WALTER, Circulation Manager

Subscription Rates—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Headley Bros., Pub., Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

ONE may doubt if any statement on the peace treaty thus far deals it such a staggering blow as the report of the minority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This minority, it must be recalled, consists of the supporters of the treaty as it stands—the political friends of Mr. Wilson. These men prove again how much more harm one sometimes suffers from the good-will of friends than from the malevolence of enemies. No such calculating, commercial, cynical view of the peace treaty has heretofore been set down in black and white. The minority Senators summarize under twelve heads which they frankly describe as "concessions" the advantages to America in signing the peace treaty. After mentioning certain advantages in customs duties and treatment of shipping, the enumeration passes to the work of the Alien Property Custodian "by which we seized and proceeded to liquidate $800,000,000 worth of property in the United States belonging to German citizens." By the treaty Germany validates this, and makes it possible, not merely to compensate Americans for losses in Germany and to settle American claims growing out of the war previous to our entrance into it, but to "pay debts which Germany or Germans owe to American citizens." Furthermore, the United States will retain over 500,000 tons of shipping "which must *more than compensate us* [the italics are ours] for shipping lost during the war." It is in the last paragraph, however, that we meet with the cream of commercialism. "We should lose our membership on the Reparations Commission, which will be the most powerful international body ever created, and which will have enormous control over the trade and commerce of Germany," and can "distribute much of her desirable exports, including dyes." Thus we drop from the Fourteen Points of Mr. Wilson to the Twelve Points of his supporters in the Senate. There is more reality about the peace treaty in the minority report than in all Mr. Wilson's oratory from the Potomac to the Pacific. It is surely time for him to pack up his speeches and come home.

ON top of the injury to the chances of the treaty done by the minority report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee comes the story told to that body by William C. Bullitt, formerly chief of the Division of Current Intelligence of the American delegation to the Peace Conference. One of the difficulties about open diplomacy as it was practiced at Paris is that somebody like Mr. Bullitt is always likely to blurt out some of its secrets. His testimony that Mr. Lansing thought the League of Nations practically worthless and opposed most of the land-grabbing programme of the peace treaty is less novel or important than his statement that when he (Mr. Bullitt) returned from Russia to Paris last spring with a plan for peace with the Soviet Government, it was only Mr. Wilson who prevented its adoption. The other members of the American peace delegation and Mr. Lloyd George favored the proposal, but the President would not give his attention to it, and later a few successes by Admiral Kolchak caused the plan to go by default. Washington was both surprised and disturbed by Mr. Bullitt's testimony, and according to a dispatch to *The Sun* (New York), sent the following day, opinion was that the revelations greatly strengthened the possibility that the peace treaty would be rejected *in toto*. No Democratic Senators were present at the hearing, it was pointed out, or some of Mr. Bullitt's testimony would probably have been shut off. In Seattle, President Wilson begged his hearers to forget that he "had anything to do with the League of Nations." Can one blame him?

WHATEVER else may be said about Mr. Bullitt's testimony, if it is correct he has convicted Mr. Lloyd George of being a deliberate falsifier. When *The Nation* stated in its issue of July 12 that Mr. Bullitt took with him to Russia a memorandum in the handwriting of Philip Kerr, Lloyd George's secretary, our statement was promptly cabled to London and resulted in a denial in Parliament on Lloyd George's behalf by Bonar Law. Lloyd George himself soon after Mr. Bullitt's return declared in Parliament that no approaches or proposals had been made by the Entente to the Soviet chiefs. Mr. Bullitt now affirms our statement about the Kerr memorandum which he took to Russia with him; and asserts that Lloyd George in conference with him

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and General Smuts discussed and approved his report on his return and that, after Lloyd George had prevaricated in the Commons, Philip Kerr called upon Mr. Bullitt in Paris to apologize "for Mr. Lloyd George's action, stating that the British Premier had found on his return to England that Lord Northcliffe and others had prepared to oust him if he recommended Soviet recognition. This is promptly denied *in toto* at London and Paris, by Mr. Kerr in particular. But Mr. Bullitt, whatever may be thought about his conduct in revealing official confidences, is a man who is usually exceptionally well fortified with documentary evidence. There is no doubt about the Kerr memorandum, and Lloyd George's record for twisting the truth for his own purposes is such that on the face of things the Bullitt version is to be relied upon unless categorically disproved.

NO week passes without its fresh revelation of Allied and American dishonesty in dealing with Russia. Last week it came not only in Mr. Bullitt's testimony, but in the form of an article reprinted in a pro-Kolchak paper at Vladivostok under date of July 31, 1919, describing a conference held at Omsk a few days earlier between the brave Admiral and all the Allied diplomats in the city, including Ambassador Morris. The defender of democracy declared that he had taken upon himself the burden of supreme power with the approval and advice of the Allies, who promised unlimited support in the struggle against the Bolshevist Government. As the support had not been forthcoming in the requisite measure, he inquired "whether it might not be advisable for him to delegate his authority to his recently appointed successor, General Denikin," and wound up by pointing out that immediate aid must consist of equipment, supplies, and finances. The French and British representatives replied that they were "in complete accord with all propositions of the Admiral," and "the representatives of the United States and Japan, after communicating with their Governments, deemed the declarations of the Supreme Ruler to be quite right and meriting full satisfaction." "The foreign ambassadors at Omsk immediately proceeded to frame the specific terms of a money loan, which will probably be completed and approved within a few days." So much for the strict American neutrality in Siberia to which the veracious Secretary Baker testified a few days ago.

ALLIED and associated statesmen have indeed reached such a pass of duplicity in this Russian matter that even official statements are no longer considered worthy of serious credence. British newspapers and public meetings frankly speculate whether Winston Spencer Churchill tells the truth in saying for the Government that the troops are being withdrawn from Archangel. General Maurice, in an analysis of the military situation, points out the complete failure of the ambitious British programme for a grand encircling attack on the Bolsheviki, owing to the lack of competent Russian support. The military position of the Bolsheviki at the close of the campaign, he declares, will be considerably stronger than it was last spring. Since he wrote, General Denikin has claimed 9,000 prisoners, while the Bolsheviki have announced the capture of Kolchak's entire southern army, totalling some 45,000 men. As for the state of mind of the foreign troops, it has just been announced that out of 104 deaths in our Siberian expeditionary force, five were suicides. We had one suicide for every five men killed in action. Will or will not Mr. Wilson bring home the troops?

WHERE power actually resides in Great Britain today is an interesting question. That it is not at Westminster is clearly enough shown by the irresponsibility of Downing Street; but all branches of the government have been turning an extraordinarily anxious eye toward Glasgow during the past week. The Trades Union Congress voted overwhelmingly in favor of Germany's admission to the League of Nations and for an immediate revision of "the harsh treaty provisions" as the first step toward reconciliation and international coöperation. By the almost unanimous vote of 4,478,000 to 77,000 it demanded the nationalization of the mines, after Mr. Smillie had declared that labor's fight for nationalization of all industries would not stop with coal. By a vote of 2,255,000 to 2,086,000, the Congress avoided taking a direct ballot on a resolution declaring "against the principle of industrial action in purely political matters," thus declining to commit itself to so-called "direct action"; but it instructed its parliamentary committee, in case the Premier proves recalcitrant on the question of nationalization, to call a special congress to decide on a "form of action to compel the Government" to adopt the views of the miners. The Congress acts with characteristic British moderation, but its action ought to make plain to the Premier and to politicians everywhere who have no plan of industrial action that they had better get one quickly, and that if they do not, the men who have a plan will not long put up with them. The pusillanimity of existing governments, with their conferences and "wise counsel" and entire lack of any constructive economic programme, is the primary cause of direct action, and it is useless to bluster and to scold those who threaten it. Empty-headed politicians cannot expect serious men to wait on them forever.

THE strike of the Boston policemen gives rise to some extremely interesting reflections upon fundamental loyalties. From all accounts, the policemen appear to have had a considerable grievance and to have had recourse to the final economic weapon only in the last instance. President Wilson calls their strike a crime against civilization; and the newspapers take up his parable after him and vie with one another in hard words. Hard words, however, butter no parsnips; and the strike brings us all within reaching distance of a question that, unless we are greatly mistaken, will shortly be fought out to an answer—and it will be lucky if in this country it is fought with the weapons of the spirit only, as it should be. Should loyalty to the state, to a political organization, in the last instance take precedence over loyalty to one's fellow-craftsmen, to an economic organization? President Wilson appears to think so, and the newspapers agree with him; but surely events like the Boston strike are happening with frequency enough to show that his answer is no longer taken as axiomatic, that many people—misguided perhaps, but not incapable of reason—hold to the contrary. We suggest that President Wilson, Governor Coolidge and those who believe that loyalty to the state is paramount, forestall such happenings by showing cause for their belief instead of abandoning themselves to mere objurgation and scurrility. We urge further that they go on and harmonize these loyalties—obviously there is great need of it—so that the opposition between them may not increase. After all, control of the economic weapon is a sufficiently serious thing, these days, to elicit something more reasonable than abuse from those who, whether they like it or not, are at its mercy. Boston at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the present moment is paying rather dearly for the ineptitude of her mayor and his associates and the obduracy of the police. Far too many of the old sanctions have passed away for any critic of public affairs to refuse the question, *Why?* Nor will it do to answer in terms of the old sanctions, as when the President says that the obligation of a policeman is as sacred and direct as that of a soldier. Suppose, on occasion, the soldiers ask, *Why?* If any movement in the world is to be met with reason and candor, it is the movement towards economic organization, especially in relation to the state.

ANYONE who had imagined that the purpose of the Senate sub-committee on Mexico was anything but to blacken that country must have had the idea dissipated by the very first hearings. Indications of bias and intention to arrive at a preconceived verdict have been as evident as at the sessions of the Lusk Committee on Bolshevism in New York State, while the treatment of witnesses friendly to Mexico has been that of an inquisition, not an investigation. Take, for instance, the war-tried and trusty method of discrediting an article on Mexico by Norman Thomas, used by Senator Fall when James G. McDonald of the League of Free Nations Association was testifying.

Senator Fall. What was Mr. Thomas's attitude during the war?

Mr. McDonald. I do not know.
Q. Was he pro-Ally?
A. I don't know.
Q. You did not investigate along that line?
A. I did not.

In its correspondence columns *The Nation* prints a letter from Mr. McDonald telling how officers of a large oil company conducted themselves at the hearing practically as members of the committee. Now and then we have the spectacle in Washington of a whitewash. In the case of Mexico it looks like a blackwash. It is a relief to turn from the activities of the Fall sub-committee to the admirable message just addressed to the American people by General Obregon, who may be the next President of Mexico. He asks us to examine the events of the revolution and the Constitutionalist régime, and to judge for ourselves whether they warrant hostility and armed attacks. He indicates that such intervention would only serve the purposes of the bandits, and expresses the belief that the great majority of the American people desire peace and oppose intervention. We believe he is right. The only question is, shall that majority or a handful of concessionaires have their way?

GENERAL PERSHING'S welcome in New York is not without interest for the student of current American psychology. Without any doubt, the people are satisfied that General Pershing did his great task well, and they desire to do him due honor. Further, his return path had been prepared with the most careful publicity. And yet, despite every circumstance calculated to stir interest and enthusiasm, the plain fact is that the people were neither interested nor enthusiastic. Is it that they are tired of parades and drives and appeals to their emotions, or that they are tired of the war and all that suggests it—or have they gone back to the old interests and the old nonchalance? The event must be a little discouraging to the apostles of universal military training, who are said to have been counting heavily on the enthusiasm awakened by General Pershing's return. As he is a military man, he might easily enough be persuaded to their point of view; and he has been relied upon to plead with Congress for their panacea. We shall not be surprised, indeed, if he appears in due time before the proper Congressional committee. If this happens, it will be interesting to see whether one general has more influence on Congress than four million doughboys.

HOWEVER odious comparisons may be it is impossible not to contrast the reception accorded to Herbert Hoover and that given to General Pershing. Without any disparagement of the latter, it must be plain to any student of the war that Mr. Hoover's service to this country and to humanity far outweighs the General's. Yet there was no Mayor's Reception Committee to greet him on the dock and there are to be no official banquets or parades or ceremonials of any kind. For this Mr. Hoover is without question grateful; the unofficial welcome to be given him by his fellows of the engineering profession will be far more to his taste. An old-fashioned American, he came back after supremely distinguished service without a decoration, having declined almost every one in Europe. Decorations, he says, are for soldiers, not such as he. Nevertheless, we wish that Congress and the country would exert themselves to recognize this great humanitarian, this extraordinary organizer and executive who conferred lustre upon the nation long before we ever entered the war and now insists upon going back to the distinguished position of being a plain and humble American citizen. Many a great reputation that was won in the war is crumbling, or has already crumbled. Many more are to go. We believe Mr. Hoover's will grow as time passes. *The Nation* is proud, indeed, that so true an American has served humanity so conspicuously and beyond all gratitude well.

HORACE TRAUBEL, who died last week, will be remembered as the editor of *The Conservator*, the author of "Chants Communal," and the careful chronicler of Walt Whitman's later days in Camden. Most people will say, and say rightly, that Traubel's biographical works will doubtless outlast his editorial and original labors. In a larger sense, this is because as editor and poet he was always a biographer, biographer of the spirit of Whitman as it still lived on after Whitman's death. We have been accustomed in the United States to the natural piety which has bound, say, Adams to Adams and Cabot to Cabot in New England, but we have seen somewhat fewer illustrations of such devotion among the more ragged, more rowdy crowd with which Whitman and Traubel were affiliated. Have we not here indeed the thing which has separated our "Philistines" from our "Populace"—the fact that one has had a sort, at least, of written tradition, while the other, burly, hearty, cheerful, impetuous, savage, irresistible, has floundered its way almost without a leader of any magnitude, and with no eminent poet and prophet save Whitman? But the centennial of Whitman has reminded us how large has been the volume of writing about him in the present century, during which he has been the most influential poet in the American-European world. His large doctrines are marching on, and the further liberation and further ennoblement of the people whose spokesman he was will assuredly set him higher in their heavens—with Traubel his invariable and indispensable companion and commentator.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shantung and the Senate

THE accompanying issue of our International Relations Section contains the first complete and accurate English translation ever made of the Chinese-German treaty of March 6, 1898, published in parallel columns with the German text, which is reproduced from a photographic copy of the document as given out by the British-controlled Imperial Maritime Customs office at Shanghai. From this can be determined precisely the rights, title, and privileges which Germany enjoyed in Shantung, and, according to the peace treaty, is to "renounce in favor of Japan." From this also can be determined Germany's right in international law to renounce these or retain them or make any disposition of them whatever. From this, furthermore, may be deduced an ample commentary upon a great many current representations and misrepresentations of the Shantung Question. From this, finally, may be gathered a cogent suggestion to the United States Senate as to a simple and honorable way out of their difficulty with this section of the peace treaty.

An examination of the Chinese-German treaty will show at once that the notion that Germany, under its terms, ever had any "sovereignty" over Shantung is an entire misunderstanding. President Wilson, for instance, whom we quoted last week in forecast of our issuance of this document, speaks of "the sovereign rights which Germany had enjoyed" in Shantung. The terms of the treaty make it abundantly clear that Germany never enjoyed any sovereign rights there, because under the provisions especially laid down she never had any to enjoy. We particularly recommend upon this point a study of Mr. Snow's masterly analysis and digest of the treaty. President Wilson goes on to say that Japan has promised "to return the sovereignty without qualification to China" and retain only certain economic rights in Shantung. But if Japan, as Mr. Wilson says, is to "get exactly what Germany had" and Germany never had a shadow of sovereignty, whence does Japan get the "sovereign rights" that she proposes so generously to return? If Japan, under the peace treaty, ever exercises a single "sovereign right" over Shantung, whether to retain or renounce it, she acts not as the beneficiary by a privilege lapsing to her from Germany, but simply as the receiver of goods stolen by the Allied Governments from China. The only explanation of Mr. Wilson's misrepresentation of the Shantung Question which can be made without the most severe implications against his integrity is that he is as ignorant of the treaty of 1898 as at the White House conference last month he professed to have been of the notorious secret treaties when he put forth his Fourteen Points in January, 1918. Such ignorance as this is extraordinary and incomprehensible; it would insure his dismissal from any post of ordinary commercial responsibility; but we see no escape from the conclusion that either by such ignorance or by flagrant dishonesty he has forfeited all right to the confidence of the public.

Now let us consider the treaty of 1898 once more with reference to the transfer by Germany to Japan of even the economic rights over Shantung. In the matter of the Russian debt, for example, the Allied Governments are strong and strenuous for the principle that the obligations incurred by one Government are binding upon a succeeding Government. They insist that Lenin ought to honor the late Czar's bills; and we believe, as we have often said, that if he would show a litttle more alacrity about doing so, the world would hear less about the horrors of Bolshevism. Mr. Wilson, too, has had a great deal to say lately about the sanctity of treaties; the secret treaties had to be kept to because, after all, a treaty is a treaty, and there the wretched things were, importunately demanding notice, and what could honorable Governments do? Very well. The Government of William II in 1898, by Article 5, Part I of the treaty, expressly made its privileges in Shantung, of whatever sort, non-transferable. If, now, the laudable principle of continuity of obligation holds in Russia and Paris, why not in Berlin? How can the Ebert Government by treaty "renounce in favor of Japan" a set of privileges which the Hohenzollern Government by treaty bound itself neither to sublet nor to alienate? Above all, how can an American President who shows such tender, such rapt and agonized solicitude about the inviolability of this principle as Mr. Wilson displayed at Paris, recommend a most unscrupulous violation of it at Washington?

Again, the Chinese concessions to Germany, according to the treaty, were leasehold rights. As such, they had held good during the period of Chinese neutrality, but as soon as China declared war upon Germany they obviously reverted to China. No other Power had or could have a vestige of legitimate claim upon them, least of all Germany herself. The action of the Allied Governments therefore bears upon an expired right. Mr. Snow says judicially that it is not a transfer of Germany's sphere of influence to Japan, but the attempted institution of a new sphere of influence in favor of Japan in Shantung. We take leave to paraphrase Mr. Snow and call it a gross and infamous act of international burglary upon a steadfast and trusting friend of this nation.

The sum of the matter is this. The Allied Governments have violated their primary principle of continuity by compelling Germany to "renounce in favor of Japan" a set of rights which (1) are by treaty non-transferable, and (2) have already reverted automatically to China. Japan has promised, according to Mr. Wilson, to return to China one set of rights which Germany never had and, therefore, never could have bequeathed her; and she proposes to keep another set of rights similar to a set which Germany had, but not the same, because Germany had lost her set, and, therefore, could not transfer them to anybody; and she gets this set of rights by an act of highwaymanry committed upon China by the Allied Governments, and in no other way. It is precisely this proceeding to which Mr. Wilson wishes to commit the Senate; precisely this to which he is endeavoring by every resource of specious candor to commit the people of the United States.

We have already many times expressed the hope that the whole peace treaty will be rejected out of hand, because it is a charter and warrant of economic imperialism. But if amendments are the best we can expect, we trust that the Shantung amendment may be formulated according to the foregoing specifications. If the Senate will merely, in Mr. Snow's words, "announce the legal situation," it need do no more. Japan's face will be saved, China's friendship reassured, and the United States will regain a great deal of reputation for fair and honest international dealing—a reputation which, with the best intentions otherwise, it has of late permitted an inconceivably ignorant or egregiously dishonest officialdom to impair most seriously.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OBERLIN COLLEGE
OBERLIN, OHIO

A Resignation Not Yet Written by Robert Lansing

DEAR Mr. President:

More than four years ago—the four most momentous years in human history—you did me the great honor to ask me to become Secretary of State. Since then I have served your Administration and our country to the best of my ability—without thought of self, I believe I may truthfully say, or of anything else but my heartfelt desire to bring to a successful conclusion the great enterprise in which the country has been engaged. But the day has now come when I must place my resignation in your hands to take effect as soon as you can possibly relieve me. I do so the more freely since it is now only a matter of a few weeks before the peace treaty will be ratified, and it will obviously be to your advantage to start the new régime ushered in by the treaty with a Secretary of State who will serve to the end of your Administration. You will, I am confident, permit me to say to you how deeply I appreciate the trust you have reposed in me and how profoundly grateful I am to have played a part in the all but overpowering events since the sinking of the Lusitania. You will recall with satisfaction, as I do, that our personal relations have been unmarred by any untoward event. I on my part am indebted to you for various kindnesses and much consideration.

Yet I should fail in my duty to myself and to the country if I omitted to set down just why I must retire. As you are well aware, I am not of the resigning kind; had I been so, I must have left the Department long ago. I realized when I took the office that, as these were exceptional times, and an unheard-of burden of responsibility rested upon you, it would not be possible for the Secretary of State to play as independent a rôle as is the rule in quiet and peaceful times. In that condition I gladly acquiesced, for I have sought no personal gain, and my record shows, I believe, that I have made no effort to seek popular favor. It has not wounded my feelings that the business of the State Department has often been conducted largely in the White House, for the magnitude of the task and the necessity of preserving the world from a German victory have left no room for any thought of personal feeling. But the bitter disappointment I have suffered in the outcome of the negotiations at Paris, at the failure to attain the Fourteen Points, to which we pledged our faith when the armistice was made, puts an end, I feel certain, to my possibilities of usefulness. I cannot forget that it was *over my own signature* that we pledged the honor of the United States and that of our allies to make peace on the Fourteen Points. As you are aware, in my appearance before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on August 5 last, truth compelled me to testify that "the fourteen peace points were never pressed before the Conference as a basis of peace, after we reached Paris." You are, I know, pleased that out of the long and exhausting discussions you obtained as much of your peace programme as you did. I cannot share your feeling. I can see nothing but a grave breach of faith, of which the historian of the future will inevitably take note to condemn it—especially on the part of our allies, who, after pledging their sacred word that they agreed to your peace points, sought little but selfish advantage and territorial aggrandizement and rearrangements which presage war.

Perhaps if I had sat through the long and wearisome sessions which fell to your lot, I, too, might feel your satisfaction. But, as you are aware, and as the press has stated, there were long stretches when I knew little or nothing of what was going on, for the decisions were reached in the Committee of Three, or Four, or Five. No vote was ever taken in the Conference; nor was it given a chance to debate a single issue. So far as General Bliss, Mr. White, and I—a majority of your fellow Commissioners—were concerned, it would have made not the slightest difference had we remained in the United States. The bitter jest—bitter because true—in the proposal of some Republican Senators to send to Mr. White a box of toys to keep himself busy would just as well have applied to myself. We often knew so little of what was going on that we sometimes found it impossible to conceal from the correspondents at our daily meeting just how ignorant we were; indeed, we often learned from them, because of the news they received through the French or British correspondents. You will have noticed the numerous times in the course of my testimony before the Senate Committee when I had to reply to questions by saying "The President handled that," or "The President knows that," or had to plead ignorance. I admit that it was my place to leave matters affecting the League of Nations to yourself and Colonel House. I could only see European society falling to pieces before our eyes. I could only feel that the delays in putting the Central Powers on their feet, and in lifting the blockade, together with the forcible annexations of territory, menaced not only the future peace, not only the safety of our allies, but *civilization itself*. Nothing could have been more mistaken than these unending delays, nor than the spirit of intolerance and revenge which actuated the French and so long prevented the restoration of normal conditions. We may consider ourselves fortunate, indeed, that we are not today witnessing the collapse into Bolshevism of every Continental state, and England, too.

But the final proof that we do not regard public matters from the same viewpoint appears in my testimony before the Senate Committee. I did not believe that it was necessary to yield to Japan in the matter of Shantung in order to obtain her signature to the treaty. At the White House on August 19, referring to me, you yourself assured the Committee that "my conclusion is different from his," as to this simple question of fact. I publicly stated to the Committee that the Shantung concession does not square with the Fourteen Points; you took the opposite point of view. You are satisfied with the treaty, publicly at least, and do not wish a change in the crossing of a *t*. The best that I could say before the Committee was that the peace treaty as a whole "substantially squared with the peace points." But it is, I am sure you must realize, as a whole very far from what we desired, very far from what we set out to obtain, very far from the idealism voiced by you that made it possible to put the country into the war. A glorious chance to rearrange the world has been lost. In Paris, General Bliss, Mr. White, and I declined to put an end to an almost intolerable situation by resigning, because, to our patriotism, that seemed like withdrawing in the face of the enemy. Now no such consideration obtains.

Again, with renewed and most hearty assurances of my personal esteem, I am, Mr. President,

Cordially and sincerely yours,

ROBERT LANSING

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Forces of Disorder

IN a week marked by the Boston police strike, the convention of the United Mine Workers, the meeting of the British Trades Union Congress, the gathering of the Confederation Générale de Travail, and the announcement of fresh victories for the armies of Soviet Russia, it is easy to understand the terror of those who believe that society is held together by external constraint—the army, the police, economic mastership, compulsion in any and every form. Everywhere the old restraints are breaking down. Not only do we hear the crash of thrones; what is more important, all about we see economic and social systems tumbling in irretrievable ruin. Russia is a communist republic, and a communist government in Hungary has been overturned only by foreign bayonets. Over enormous areas of eastern Europe, the people have simply seized the land, and in Italy the king resorts to the patent device of making the state a present of the crown domains. Paul Scott Mowrer returns from France to report almost the entire life of that country rapidly organizing itself along syndicalist lines. In Great Britain the Trades Union Congress votes well-nigh unanimously for nationalization of the mines, and follows up its action by a further resolution to "compel" acceptance of its programme—a resolution declared by *The Daily Telegraph* to be equivalent to a declaration of war upon constitutional government. In Mexico, the Constitutionalist Government, in face of the most powerful and determined opposition, steadily adheres to the policy already written into its fundamental law—the recovery for the Mexican people of control of their natural resources.

In our own country the hitherto conservative railroad Brotherhoods demand nationalization of the roads and operation at cost, on a basis absolutely new, by the men who actually make up the industry. The convention of the American Federation of Labor is swept off its feet by the plan as by a flood, and conservative labor leaders are left panting on the bank as the stream rushes by. The United Mine Workers not only back the railroad men, but vote with only a single dissenting voice for the nationalization of the mines and other subversive policies. And now even our trusty bluecoats turn; Boston's police go on strike. But Boston's situation is not unique. Throughout the country we face the same problem of organization of civil servants, with conflicting loyalties to occupational groups as opposed to political organizations. Will the Boston answer prove typical? When laborers refuse to work and policemen strike and soldiers mutiny, is not society itself about to crumble down in universal dissolution? Are not the forces of disorder everywhere on the very verge of success? Are they not threatening with utter destruction those principles of private property and political organization on which rests our hope for order and political stability? Let the riot act be read and the machine gun made ready!

It is in some such terms, we are persuaded, that the psychology of our rulers must be read, and yet—are these the true forces of disorder? Who has made war on Russia and strangled Hungary? Not the plain people of the United States—or, we venture to add, of Great Britain and France and Italy. Who has shaped at Paris a League of Nations deftly fashioned to "insure peace" among all the questioning peoples gathered about the throne of the great god of things as they are? Not the plain people. Who is striving with might and main to involve us in war with Mexico and to snatch away from the Mexicans the precious fruits of nine years of bloody revolutionary struggle? Not the plain people. Who is demanding huge armies and unmatchable navies and eighteen-inch guns and shrapnel and poison gas? Not the plain people. Who is clamoring for universal military service? Not the plain people. Who is insisting on repressive laws, on jailings and deportations? Not the plain people. Who has taken the initiative in the systematic campaign of hatred that now for years has filled our press and pulpits and universities, turning its poisoned darts first against the Germans, then against the Bolsheviks, the Nonpartisans, and finally against everyone whose ideas hold aught of menace for the privileges embalmed in the existing order? Not the plain people. We do not blame the men who do these things. Conceiving society to be held together only by the bond of external compulsion, they are bound to fight with all their might the men and the movements that appear to be breaking that bond before their eyes. We do not blame them; we only ask, which are actually the forces of disorder? Is society really held together by hate or love, by compulsion or attraction?

If we look more keenly, we shall see, not an old society crumbling, but a new society coming into being. It comes indeed with travail and strong crying, and where the old order resists to the death, with violence and bloodshed. The old order was political, military, exploitative; the new is economic, industrial, productive. Wherever it comes to birth, be it in Siberia, London, or Rock Island, there we find the people struggling to organize themselves into self-governing producing groups from which exploitation shall be absent. This is the spirit of life, not death; of order, not disorder. This is the spirit that the fat, the comfortable, the unthinking today find so profoundly disturbing and dangerous. This is the spirit that gives its deeper meaning to the turmoil in Russia and the convulsive struggles in Hungary, to the deep-going movement for decentralization in France, to the profound industrial and political revolution in Great Britain, to the steadily gathering unrest in our own country—an unrest scarcely articulate as yet, but none the less already beyond the control of the politician and the old-line "leader." This spirit cannot be slain by shrapnel; it cannot be exorcised by the incantations of political medicine men chanting the old formulas of political democracy and urging the sufferers from this strange new disease to scourge themselves more violently with the whip of hard work. This spirit is indeed profoundly subversive—of much that ought to be subverted; but it is the spirit of order and not disorder—the order that shall be. Civilization stands today at its dawn, not its sunset; though we shutter the eastern windows, yet will the sunlight flood the earth. At this hour, despite the darkness, thoughtful and reasonable men may well thank God and take courage, making ready against the labors of the day that is to come. For "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Salteena

MR. SALTEENA has come to stay. It will do no good for the skeptical to go on arguing that Daisy Ashford must be but a transient alias of Sir James Matthew Barrie because no child of nine or any other age could possibly have stumbled upon so many ludicrous—not to say amiably improper—situations and sentiments, while the record of Sir James shows well enough that he could have; or because those who have read the "The Young Visiters" aloud have been amazed to find that a firm-voiced reader who does not wince at the childish spelling and punctuation but goes straight forward will fall into a cadence not unlike that of the whimsical begetter of Peter Pan and Lob; or—to resort to exegesis—because at the levee the Prince of Wales in "The Young Visiters" comports himself with a fine lack of regal pretension already made famous in "A Kiss for Cinderella," where the other Prince rocks sulkily on the dais and hates to get down to business, even to choose a bride from among the loveliest candidates. It will do no good for the skeptical to argue. Whether or not Daisy Ashford is as real as the papers say she is, Mr. Salteena is as real as the March Hare or the decapitating Duchess or the horrendous Snark.

Poor elderly Alfred Salteena! He is a warning and a model to his whirling age. Consider, for instance, the unsuccess of his suit to the obliging Ethel. "He had quite a young girl staying with him of 17 named Ethel Monticue." The conditions seem incredibly propitious, but he loses her to the thinner and younger Bernard Clark. The serious Mr. Galsworthy would have ended the story differently. Indeed, Mark Lennan in "The Dark Flower" is a sort of Mr. Salteena, like Salteena "fond of asking peaple to stay with him" and like him unable to have his youthful mistress. But Lennan can be only tragic. Mr. Salteena, however, after Ethel has rejected him forever faces an empty world so courageously that he later has "a large family 5 of each." If he is a warning to his age in that he philanders too long, he is a model in that he rises above his defeat and meets his universe certainly at least half way. Such energy will reconstruct, and repeople, all of Europe.

But as becomes an age when sterner things call all men away from merely personal occupations and concerns, Mr. Salteena is no mere lover. He is also a man alight with the instinct for self-betterment. "I am not quite a gentleman," he admits, "but you would hardly notice it." Money and pains and embarrassment are no objects to him where his ambition is at stake. He gives the Earl of Clincham £42 to "rub him up a bit in Socierty ways"; he very humbly mixes with the Earl for grammar; and he dares even the wrath of the Prince to perfect himself in the nicer "etiquett" of the court. A less resolute aspirant might never have risked it in home-made garters and breeches merely improvised. But Mr. Salteena stops at nothing, and finally receives his reward—a job at the palace "cantering after the royal barouche." After all, this is no more than might have been expected from the degree to which he showed himself adaptable to circumstances in the third chapter. "Afte dinner Ethel played some merry tunes on the piano and Bernard responded with a rarther loud song in a base voice and Ethel clapped him a good deal. Then Mr. Salteena asked a few riddles as he was not musicle."

The Chorus Girl Irredenta

OF course this is an age of reform from which the chorus girl cannot hope to escape, but one had not supposed her turn would come so soon. Self-determination, it is agreed, is a good thing for Czecho-Slovaks, Greco-Thracians, Italo-Fiumians, and other persons at a minimum distance of 3,000 miles, but in these United States we thrive not on self-determination but on determination by our neighbors—not necessarily even a majority of them, but most any sufficiently bumptious minority that can get the names of a few Best Families on its stationery as honorary vice-presidents, and obtain the services of a reliable press agent. It is our passion to become our brother's keeper; we are not averse even to becoming his jailer.

Inevitably, therefore, the chorus girl must reform; must conform. She must be uplifted; must be welfared. The trouble is we had not expected it was to come so soon. Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., with her chain of clubhouses where chorus girls may spend their leisure decorously sipping tea with college undergraduates and tired business men, under the tactful supervision of a certified chaperon, is in line with the tendency of the day, but is it not pressing us laggards at the rear too hard? In our vision we had not supposed that the chorus girl would be abolished simultaneously with the cocktail. We had estimated that the chorus girl would survive at least as long as the cigarette. (Uncharitable persons might suggest that she could not survive after it). To find ourselves wrong is disconcerting, for if the time is at hand to reform chorus girls, is it not possible that the next victims will be journalists? We will resist the reform of journalists to the bitter end. All journalists will; because they know they need it so much, and they need so much of it.

Another point. Granted that the wishes of the chorus girls themselves should not be considered in this matter of their reform, are we justified in ignoring the sentiments of the tired business man and the college undergraduate? The feelings of the t. b. m. should be considered, because he is a factor in efficient industrialism (for which America is to be made safe), and the college undergraduate is at least potentially such. We cannot picture the bald-headed row adjourning with enthusiasm at 11 p. m. to Mrs. Rockefeller's uplifting establishments, there to sip lemonade and munch wafers with the chorus, while a phonograph wheezes in one corner of the parlor and the certified chaperon sits knitting in another. The atmosphere, one conceives, would be about as joyful as that of a dentist's reception room.

And last, but not least, we give a thought to Broadway—the Broadway of romance and tradition; the Broadway that explains why girls leave home and sensible folk stay there. For the chorus girl is essentially not a person but a tradition—a rollicking, laughing, careless child of a day and a night. Gently, Mrs. Rockefeller, with our tradition; softly with the romance of Broadway. Spare us this last grasshopper, singing blithely into a winter of industrial efficiency—and crickets.

Some day, perhaps, we shall evolve reformers who do not reform, just as we have achieved directors who do not direct, but meanwhile we ask that the fifteen years' grace accorded the Saar Valley be granted to the Unredeemed Journalist, and we demand a plebiscite of tired business men and college undergraduates for the Chorus Girl Irredenta.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lo! the Poor Professor

By JOHN W. BRADFORD

DURING the long summer days, the land has been filled with the strident voice of the money raiser. The Croats have been relieved, the Armenians succored, the Fukienians supplied with old clothes; now it is the college professor who must have greater temporal rewards for spiritual labors. This is well. Amid the clangor of other campaigns and drives this one may excite no special attention. Not a few will receive publicity of the nicest sort, the gratitude of happy families restored to a sound civic basis, and, perhaps, honorary degrees. Being engrossed in preparing a new edition of Dante with copious notes, I should ordinarily give no more thought to this latest form of American diversion than to Theda Bara's latest movie.

There runs through all this stridulation, however, a shrill, almost neurotic, note which must, of necessity, attract the concern of the most indifferent scholar—the professor must be made content. President Lowell is reported as quoting an old graduate to the effect that "of all people in the world, the teachers of our youth must not be discontented." Another writer, expanding in the ample spaces of a Sunday newspaper, with a half-mysterious fling, warns us that the terrible spook, Bolshevism, will "rot and spot" the teaching profession unless, forsooth, salaries are increased. Speaking as if he knew the inside facts, he tells us that already low wages are breeding the pestilential bacilli—the fatal red streptococci. Evidently, therefore, this roaring clangor is not for nothing, not for sheer love of the poor professor and his works, but in it there is the note of fear that all is not well in our intellectual foundries; that the grimy sons of grammar and rhetoric may make common cause with the grimy sons of Cain and Vulcan. This interests me. It ought to interest any one who labors day and night with Dante.

Now we see clearly what we have hitherto seen only darkly. The ideal American professor, as college presidents, trustees, and alumni behold him, stands forth in full splendor. He is dressed in a well-tailored suit, with trousers perfectly creased. He has changes of attire, including neckties, for every day in the week. He may visit the barber fortnightly, keeping his shaggy locks in harmony with the freshman's latest cut. He has money for travel. His wife and two children are tastefully if not elegantly dressed. Those corroding cares that come from keeping up the appearances of polite and gracious gentility on a day laborer's wages are brushed away. Even a taxi may be taken to the president's annual reception at the executive mansion. The professor has his library, ample and correct. He speaks a faultless English, such as he could learn in those circles which Thackeray loved, with perhaps a slight Oxford accent, not too pronounced, but delightfully suggesting exotic culture. He looks with beaming eye at the best of all possible worlds over the rims of champagne glasses—alas, now filled with water, because the increase in salary did not come in time to permit him to lay in his forty years' private stock. No discontent here.

How glorious, if true! But, my friends, not true. I have taught for more than a quarter of a century and know my fellow-creatures in the academic world. As I run over the list of professional friends I can truly say that I do not find one who is discontented with the world and its works because his salary is small. In the institution I know best, there are eight or ten distinguished men who are discontented with this best of all possible worlds. All of them have private means, or are the highest salaried men in the institution, and could readily find more remunerative employment elsewhere. Having enough money to free them from the deadly necessity of burning up their intellectual furniture to keep the pot boiling—to use Lowell's happy phrase—they have time to discover a multitude of things unknown to the starving underlings. Clipping a goodly quantity of coupons every month from bonds ranging from Japanese sterling fours to Pennsylvania generals, they do not worry about the president, the trustees, the Republican party, Woodrow Wilson, or the next election. They have time to think and are rid of fear-thought. They are the dangerous, discontented trouble-makers in our faculty. If we were rid of them and had only wretched youngsters, or old men grown decrepit in trying to down the ghost of disrespectability, we should have the most complacent, conservative, rock-ballasted faculty in the country. Their motto, the sign of their strength, the device of their hope, would be "Gardez la foi"; not "Après moi le déluge."

So it is with amusement that I think of the illusion that besets the trustees when they make the following changes in the academic budget:

> Septimus Bangs, junior professor of applied Christianity; from $1,200 to $1,420.
>
> Alcibiades Scroggs, junior professor of rhetoric and composition; from $1,800 to $2,000.
>
> Wolfram Pedersen, junior professor of Norse philology; from $1,200 to $1,500.
>
> William Akerton, junior professor of hog practice; from $3,000 to $4,000.
>
> Henry Wrigley Pepp, junior professor of advertising; from $6,000 to $8,000.

It simply will not work out as expected. If they are discontented with their lot now, they will be more discontented when they adopt the new magnificence which their increases will permit. If they are content now, they may, on seeing and beholding shamelessly the things money might buy, from neckties to limousines, become discontented. A mad world, my masters, and professors as mad as any. Trouble for the bourgeois began when first the dust took human form at divine command. The end of creation was not perfectly tailored pants, nor a silver tea set. Increases in salary will buy these, but not the closed eye or the sealed heart. These are in the keeping of one the latchet of whose shoes we are not worthy to unloose and whose holy purposes it is our destiny to fulfil.

One more word, ere we part. I have just set down on paper for my own edification a list of ten of the greatest teachers from whom I have learned the most, all of whom even a grudging age of pork-packers will hold in some semblance of esteem: James Russell Lowell, Henry Adams, John Ruskin, Charles Darwin, Percy Shelley, Diderot, Milton, Erasmus, Dante, and the Master of Them that Know. Peace to their ashes. Does any one suppose that they would be "contented" as full or junior instructors on any salary that a mighty drive could provide?

When all our professors are satisfied with this best of all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible worlds, then the sceptre of learning will pass—if indeed it even now remains in academic hands—to those who suspect that new light may yet break in upon them that watch by the gates of dawn. The business of scholarship is thinking; not returning to doting parents the undisturbed minds of their offspring. And, as Matthew Arnold has so finely said, "Thought, which made all institutions, inevitably saps them, resting only in that which is absolute and eternal." In the distributive justice of divine economy thought is not given to professors according to the size of their salaries. Neither can budgets or trustees' resolutions, the cheers of alumni or the tears of departing seniors, or any other thing in heaven or earth or in the sea or the deeps thereof, restrain the heaving tides that now creep soft as drifting down and now thunder with angry menace along the shores where Canute hath planted his throne and fixed his standard. Let salaries be increased by all means; but though we heap up silver as the dust and prepare raiment as the clay, yet will the Creator not be mocked nor the wisdom and understanding He hath lodged in the mind of His creatures be sealed as if darkness had come upon the waters and the stars were blotted out of the firmament.

Business and the Church

THE National Civic Federation has for many years been engaged in the promotion of better relations between capital and labor. In pursuance of this worthy end, the chairman of the council of the Federation, Mr. Ralph M. Easley, has been carrying on a campaign against socialists and other propagandists of subversive doctrine. The following correspondence reveals Mr. Easley's activities in a somewhat new light, and also gives cheering indication of "the emerging independence of the church," to quote the words of the friend to whom we are indebted for these letters.

As Mr. Morgan points out in his letter, the church cannot adequately perform its true function in the community unless it is prepared to face the insistent social problems of the hour. Churchmen as such do not pretend to expert knowledge of questions of economics and politics; but in order that they may carry on unhampered the work of self-education and may contribute their due part to the all-important process of government by discussion, they must insist on hearing all sides of every question. They do well, therefore, to be jealous of every attempt by outside groups to assert control over the church. Mr. Morgan's letter, in its admirable catholicity and fairness, is another bit in the accumulating mass of evidence that the church is recognizing its responsibilities to all classes of society. The correspondence follows:

THE NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION

New York, July 25

MR. WILLIAM FELLOWES MORGAN,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Morgan: I have read with interest and sympathetic appreciation the announcement of the organization of the Every Name Movement, the purpose of which was so well represented by you in the press statements.

In connection with that, I desire to call your attention to a situation which a good many members of the National Civic Federation consider a serious one, namely, the rapid growth of Socialism in the churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish alike. Unless the sane and conservative religious business men, such as you are proposing to organize, take an interest in this matter in all the churches, a state of affairs will develop which will cause serious trouble. In fact, trouble is already developing.

It will not do to leave these matters entirely in the hands of the clergy. There are, of course, brilliant exceptions in all denominations but, as a rule, the clergy are not equipped by training to deal with the practical, hard-headed business propositions that employers and labor leaders have to consider when they are dealing, for example, with strikes, and, naturally, they have not the time to get at first hand the facts that would enable them to form a correct judgment on such matters.

In a study I made recently, I was surprised to find that practically all of the church committees or commissions dealing with industrial matters are dominated by socialists or by those of an extreme, radical type of mind. While proposing to deal with the question of American labor conditions, they give voice only to the views of the Socialist wing in this country or those of the British Labor Party in England, which is working on an out-and-out socialist programme.

The trouble with many of the preacher-secretaries of these social service movements is that they do not differentiate between social reform and socialism, while many of them are socialists, pure and simple, and do not wish to differentiate. The American Federation of Labor and the Railway Brotherhoods have all they can do to beat down the forces of disorder in their own fields and, from what I hear, some of them think that the employing and business classes, who largely dominate the boards of trustees of the churches—the Protestant churches at least—should protect them from attack in the rear by church organizations.

Your new movement relates only to the work of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and, while, as stated, all the churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, are alike permeated with these dangerous doctrines, the Protestant Episcopal Church is especially open to that criticism. You doubtless have seen the announcement of the Church League for Social and Industrial Democracy, of which the Right Rev. Charles David Williams, Bishop of Michigan, is the chairman. On its committee are several well-known socialist clergymen, among them being the man who so fulsomely praised the I. W. W. in an address at the General Convention held in New York in 1913, without any protest being made.

Another Episcopalian movement is The Church Socialist League in America. *The New York Daily Call*, the leading organ of the socialists, reports this organization as "calling upon the church to repudiate its affiliation with the capitalist system," and goes on to say: "The Church Socialist League in America reorganized itself at a meeting in the People's House (Rand School) and issued a manifesto to which it will try to rally all the progressive forces in the Protestant Episcopal Church throughout the country. Right Rev. Paul Jones, former Bishop of Utah, was elected president, and Rev. W. B. Spofford, organizing secretary. Irwin St. John Tucker was elected chairman of the committee on activities at the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church to be held in Detroit next October."

This Irwin St. John Tucker, who is designated to take such an active part in the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, is the same gentleman who was convicted in Chicago of sedition and sentenced to a twenty years' term for violation of the Espionage Law.

The National Civic Federation last spring sent a commission to Europe to study industrial conditions. This commission has just returned and is now formulating its conclusions. It will make its report at a meeting called by the Federation on Monday and Tuesday, September 8 and 9, and at the same meeting there will be considered the labor situation in America. These

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subjects will be discussed by representative labor men and employers. It has been decided to invite all representatives from the reconstruction committees of the various churches, in order that they may not only hear what the labor men and employers themselves think on these matters, but also may have an opportunity of expressing their own views. I hope that the Every Name Movement will accept the invitation, when it is issued, to send a representation.

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH M. EASLEY

RALPH M. EASLEY, ESQ.,

The National Civic Federation, N. Y.

My dear Mr. Easley: Absence from the city, coupled with a desire to give your letter of July 25 the thoughtful consideration which it demands, have postponed till now my reply.

We are living in a period of vital change. There are many divergent views as to the nature of the reforms which existing conditions require. These will have to be reconciled according to our democratic custom in the adjustment to meet the demands of the new age. Discussion of the various proposals to that end is covering a wide range, in church circles as elsewhere, which I think you will agree is altogether desirable, inasmuch as no church establishment is fully discharging its functions which does not to the extent of its resources seek to assist in the solutions of the problems which the world is facing.

Now, as to the "rapid growth of socialism in the churches" which you charge. My specific interest is in the Episcopal Church. A cardinal principle of that church is that its communicants shall enjoy the fullest expression of their views, but with the understanding that such views, clerical or lay, must in no sense be interpreted as representing the attitude of the church as a whole, which can only be expressed through its duly constituted bodies. In the absence of any declaration by the General Convention or any duly authorized committee or commission upon pending issues, I suggest that it is not just to attribute to the church any attitude either for or against socialism. If there is a tendency toward socialism on the part of individuals or groups of individuals within the Church, such as you suggest, I venture to say this tendency is not more markedly developed in Episcopal circles than it is within the body of our citizens as a whole; and while extreme radicals outside the church, like extreme radicals within it, may be more strident and more prone to make themselves heard, there is no evidence yet at hand to indicate that they constitute a majority of the community.

After all, whatever the present tendencies may be, I can see nothing but benefit to be derived from broad discussion of our social problems, even within the Episcopal Church. That is one of the safety valves of our form of government. Rev. Dr. William T. Manning, Rector of Trinity, in a recent statement on our Every Name Campaign, with particular reference to the question we are now discussing, said, with very great point: "At a time like this it is natural that there should be extravagant views and unregulated enthusiasms. It is inevitable that the vision should carry some of our brethren off their feet and lead them to confuse liberty with lawlessness, and progress with social destruction and disintegration. Perhaps we need these extreme views to spur us on to true progress."

True progress is what we are all aiming at. Indulge us a personal note. I do not share the views of Trotzky or Lenin. I am opposed to such doctrines as are embraced in the theories of those radicals who advocate the assumption of all enterprise and initiative by the State. And I have reason to believe that the gentlemen with whom I am associated in the Every Name Campaign of the Episcopal Church, for the most part laymen and business men and vitally interested in stable, progressive government, share my views in this regard. But in these days of progress, when a "rapid growth of socialism" is alleged, one is impelled to ask for a definition of "socialism" with reference to the present crisis in the world's history. Many of the activities upon which our Government has embarked with the full approval of the people to remedy evils, and make the Government more responsive to the popular will, have within your memory and mine been stamped as highly socialistic. Then consider the present situation. You say: "The American Federation of Labor and the Railway Brotherhoods have all they can do to beat down forces of disorder in their own fields," and you protest that they should be protected from "attack in the rear by church organizations," which latter, you say, "while proposing to deal with the question of American labor conditions" urge the view of the "British Labor Party in England, which is working on an out-and-out socialist program."

Yet we find the American Federation of Labor and the Railway Brotherhoods urging upon the country a plan for the socialization of our railways which is far in advance of the British Labor Plan. Is one more socialistic than the other?

I merely cite this by way of pointing out the desirability of an agreement as to what "socialism" is, without going into the merits of either plan and assenting to the proposition that the Episcopal Church is urging the one or the other.

The fact is, I believe, that when our people come to face the issues squarely the test will be not whether a proposed reform is or is not "socialistic," but will it remedy a downright evil, meet a real demand—will it conduce to the well being, the happiness, and the prosperity of the whole people? Of this much we are sure: The old order has passed. One great good which has come out of the war is a reassertion of the essential equality of mankind. The war was a great leveller. In that crisis we all had to put our shoulders to the wheel, rich and poor, high and low, and with all former rank and distinction swept away each of us fitted into the groove to which he was best suited. It is in that spirit that we must face our present problems. Somewhere between the extreme on either side there is a middle ground upon which the foundations of the new age will be laid.

It is the purpose of the Every Name Campaign of the Episcopal Church in New York, which is a part of the Nation-Wide Campaign of the Church, by education, by propaganda, by personal contact with every member of the organization, to awaken our people to a sense of their responsibility as citizens and church members, and to assist in the solution of these problems. In connection with the Campaign, a nation-wide survey of the resources of the Church is being made. When the General Convention of the Church meets in Detroit in October, it will have before it a complete picture of the Church organization, together with all the facts as to its wants, needs and aspirations. Thereafter a programme of nation-wide church activity will be formulated as representative of the Episcopal attitude toward the new age. Whether it will be "socialistic" or not, I am unable to forecast. But under the leadership of the broadminded Bishops and clergy and the body of laymen who will there represent every section of the country, and every point of view of the Church, I have full confidence that the Church in keeping step with the march of progress, and in meeting the demands of the new era upon which we have entered, will continue to be sound, patriotic, and worthy of her traditions.

Very truly,

WILLIAM FELLOWES MORGAN

Contributors to this Issue

JOHN W. BRADFORD is the pseudonym of one of the best-known among the younger American scholars.

L. J. DE BEKKER is a New York newspaper man of long standing whose recent articles on Mexico in *The Nation* have attracted wide attention.

ROBERT P. UTTER, editor, critic, and poet, was head of the department of English at the A. E. F. University at Beaune.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mexico's Future

By L. J. de BEKKER

THE future of Mexico, and indeed of every country, can be nothing but the outgrowth of the present. At present, says the Mexican Secretary of the Treasury, "Mexico is convalescent." And Don Luis Cabrera goes on to show that an epidemic of revolution, of war and economic unrest, attacked all humanity some ten years ago, Mexico being the first nation to fall sick. Watching the feverish period which followed the ousting of Huerta, the press found Mexico's ailment fatal, and published her obituary before she was "kilt entirely." A bad case of measles, Señor Cabrera admits, but nothing so bad as the plague now ravaging Russia. If Mexico is on the way to recovery, which is my own opinion, President Carranza was not far wrong in expressing the hope that he would be able to leave a completely pacified country to his successor in office in December, 1920. In this event I forecast a bright future for our neighbor. Indeed, I venture to suggest the possibility that in ten years from now the people of Mexico may find themselves in the delectable position as regards taxation in which subjects of the Prince of Monaco are now unique—tax free.

It is not altogether beyond possibility that the nationalization of petroleum may make Mexico the richest nation on earth. Let us for the moment waive all thought of the Tampico and Tuxpan oil fields, which are almost wholly controlled by British and American capital, but exported in the year 1918 58,560,553 barrels of petroleum—together with the political and financial questions involved. Waiving this, it is beyond the range of controversy that Article 27 of the new Constitution of 1917 stands good in international law, once its retroactive features, which are contradicted by another section of the same fundamental law, are eliminated. That means that all future oil discoveries will be the property of the Mexican nation, and can be developed on a royalty system by which the operators will be allowed sufficient profits to encourage the investment of brains and money, but without giving the lion's share to foreigners —a lion's share which enabled Lord Cowdray's company to pay a 25% dividend last year, and the Royal Dutch Shell to pay dividends for the last two years of 38 and 48%.

Ever since I got into the heart of Mexico I have had a strong conviction that the oil regions of the republic still undeveloped but known to the higher officials of the government, and perhaps to certain Americans also, vastly exceed the properties now exploited, affording, in view of the constantly increasing demand for mineral oil, the certainty of enormous wealth. I knew that Mexican, French, British, and American oil men had been exploiting every part of the United States of Mexico for several years. I knew that these investigations had covered the Yucatan peninsula, Lower California, the States of the Central plateau, and those of the Pacific coast. The Mexican officials had been perfectly frank with me in discussing financial affairs, giving me the very latest figures regarding the national debt, the foreign loans, the revenues, and the railways. No information was forthcoming on petroleum. I never met a more courteous or companionable lot of people than these same Mexican officials, and I had found them ready at all times to lay their cards on the table face up—except when it came to petroleum. My "hunch" is that not more than a tenth of Mexico's known petroleum resources are being operated as I write. I believe that if Mexico enjoys for ten years to come as peaceful a rule as that which now exists, her exports will be ten times as great as in 1918, and that nine-tenths of the increase will be of oil owned by the nation. Bear in mind that the population of Mexico is now only 15,000,000, and then take your paper and pencil and figure to yourself the extraordinary magnitude of the per capita wealth which will flow into Mexico from this source alone. Cuba's profits in sugar will seem as a drop in the bucket.

Even if my "hunch" is wrong, however, peaceful development for ten years certainly means a bright future for Mexico. Mexico is naturally, as the Englishman says of his modern flat, "self-contained." Her tropical coasts produce an abundance of bananas, the cheapest food in the world; of cocoanuts, which yield the cheapest and most wholesome vegetable oil for food, as well as sugar; and the tropical fruits, which are valuable for their delicacy and nutritive qualities. The temperate zone includes vast areas suitable to the cultivation of cereals in which, to take a single instance, the yield of corn is immense, and there are two crops a year. The pasturage for cattle and sheep surpasses that of any other country in America. The mines abandoned years ago by Spanish owners are yielding handsome returns under modern methods, and a single mine in the Valley of Mexico, reported in the latest book on that country as having been shut down since the retirement of President Diaz, is actually shipping $15,000,000 a month in bullion.

Mexico needs above all things peace, schools, and irrigation. No one knows it better than the Mexicans themselves. Mexico, which had a population of 30,000,000 when Cortez landed, and can support three times that population today, is, notwithstanding the long domination by Spain, the most American of all American countries, for the aborigines constitute 85% of the population, and this Indian element, which has dwindled under the oppression of centuries, has produced its fair share of the men who have distinguished themselves in the public life of their country. There are possibilities in the peon which neither Diaz nor any of his predecessors was willing to develop. What they wanted was peon labor. What the Mexicans themselves want, and what I hope they may have, is a nation in which the standard of illiteracy shall be reduced from the present 80% to a point at which the only adults who cannot at least read and write will be the congenitally defective. That condition cannot be brought about in less than a generation, but I am happy to say that I saw the beginning of the system of universal education, the necessity for which is now admitted by all parties and all classes of Mexican society.

But if the germ of the future is in the present, it is worth while to make it clear that conditions in Mexico at this time are by no means as bad as they have been painted. One of the most astonishing bits of unintentional misinformation was furnished by a map of Mexico in a New York daily of June 22, which purported to prove that rebel forces rule one-half of Mexico. This map showed by various shadings the territory controlled by the rebel leaders. Were it correct, it would have been physically impossible for me and my good wife either to have entered Mexico last February,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or to have left that country two months later, although our passports, with all due visés, would suffice to convince any court of justice that we are right in believing that we *were* in Mexico. This map shows that between Vera Cruz and Mexico City is a large tract of territory controlled by Felix Diaz. Yet we passed through, accompanied by a party of Mexicans who would have furnished a big haul to any bandit.

The map shows that on June 22 all of the State of Puebla and part of Guerrero were ruled by Emiliano Zapata, despite the fact that we had visited the City of Puebla, had dined with the governor in his palace, and returned to Mexico City without seeing any trace of disorder, and the additional fact that Zapata and the handful of followers remaining to him were killed by soldiers last April. The map shows that Felix Diaz and "General" Pelaez together rule practically all of the State of Tamaulipas and the northern part of Vera Cruz. Therefore we could not possibly have travelled from San Luis Potosi to Tampico to get a steamer for New York, and instead of finding the oil men in Tampico paying their taxes to the Carranza Government, we should have had to interview Diaz or Pelaez. Equally absurd, of course, was the assignment of all of Chihuahua, and parts of Durango, Sonora and Coahuila to Villa. This territory includes the cities of Juarez, Chihuahua, Parral, San Pedro, and Torreon, all of which, unless the American authorities in Mexico are mightily deceived, are loyal to the Carranza Government. Ambassador Fletcher has testified that Villa controls merely the land on which he is camping for the time being. Pelaez, who was retreating before the Carranza soldiers in Tamaulipas when I left Mexico, was estimated to have in all less than 200 men. These figures were given me by a Belgian oil inspector who had spent eighteen months in the oil jungle, and were not disputed by the oil men residing in Tampico. It is doubtful if Diaz has fifty followers, and it is certain that he was unable to prevent the destruction of the landing party led to his support last winter by General Blanquet, whose death occurred shortly after that of Zapata.

Conditions in Mexico are bad enough without any misrepresentation. The loss in property during ten years of civil strife has run into the hundreds of millions. A minor official who had taken part in some of the severest fights of the whole period told me that he believed the total sacrifice of human life had been not less than 1,000,000. Zapata left the rich State of Morelos, the centre of the Mexican sugar industry, in ruins, so that not a mill was standing, and for a time it was necessary for Mexico to import sugar. Villa has made it impossible to work some of the richest mines in northern Mexico even now. Pelaez still keeps from their homes scores of Americans who settled in the interior of Tamaulipas, attracted by the wonderfully fertile soil and the climate. It is doubtful if the great Mexican country estates, taking them by and large, would show today more than half the wealth in horses, cattle, sheep, or farm implements, that they possessed ten years ago. The railways of Mexico are badly in need of all kinds of rolling stock and equipment, and should be augmented by new lines to tap undeveloped mineral and agricultural lands. The international claims for damages from the United States of Mexico because of the destruction of foreign-owned property during the revolution now number 9,073, and may be expected to total $400,000,000. There is still insufficient revenue to pay all interest and principal of government bonds. These are the worst features of the situation as it appears today.

To offset them the first asset is the will to live in peace and happiness, which, I believe, now animates ninety-nine out of every hundred Mexicans; the fact that the revenues are now $180,000,000 per annum, more than at any period of the nation's history; that the greatest drain is the army, which is much smaller now than in years, and will be still further reduced as the bandits are subdued. Add to these facts increased profits from the railways, a better system of general taxation, a present prosperity everywhere evident in the Central States of Mexico, and an abundant supply of gold and silver money which is above par in exchange, and there are ample reasons for optimism as to Mexico. Only a continuation of war can complete the ruin of this rich country, and the Mexican people know it as well as we do.

The Most Contemplative Man's Recreation

By ROBERT P. UTTER

DOUBTLESS the contemplative man's recreation was a great discovery in its day. Killing a fish or two must have been a real relaxation after such nervous work as chopping off a king's head and fighting battles like Naseby and Worcester. Or was it the other way round? A man killed his dozen or so of fish before breakfast, said "Fie upon this quiet life; I want work," and set out on the trail of the King, or the Roundheads. Whichever way it was, our extremes today lie farther apart. We have bagged a brace of emperors—we lost count of the kings long ago—and alongside Verdun, Naseby and Worcester look like cozy little nursery squabbles. Therefore our search for tranquility must go beyond fishing. The time is ripe to maintain in the face of Izaak and all his disciples that the pursuit of the harmless necessary mushroom, specifically, the untamed *Agaricus Campestris*, has more recreation for the most contemplative man than any angling that has ever been invented or ever can be.

First, be it granted that recreation is regeneration, "spiritual new-birth," a time of re-charging the batteries exhausted by steady drain and repeated shock. This at once puts fly-fishing out of the question, for a contemplative man can no more re-charge his batteries during a fight than can a submarine. When he has stretched his nerves in pursuit of dollars, ideals, or ideas, can he relax them in fighting trout, salmon, or tarpon? Something, indeed, might be said for perch-fishing from the stern of a flat-bottomed boat, hung on an invisible surface over the brown green depth of a shady cove, or under the shade of the bucolic hat on the open pond. You amputate the legs of a superannuated chair, and screw its upper works to the stern thwart. You load your pipe for a long smoke more carefully than you bait your hook. If you are fortunate in having no fisherman's luck, you may learn to calculate the orbit of the kingfisher, or guess why the lucky bugs so furiously rage together.

But the more you catch the less you are re-created. A perch on the hook under normal conditions is a very slight interruption to the contemplative process, but if it comes at a critical time it may be just enough to lose you the glowing thought the tail of which you were about to grasp;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY COLLEGE
OBERLIN, OHIO

the thought that would have overcome the last argument of the customer who failed you last week—or would have been just the thing for the gambit of that sermon on "Open Plumbing in Literature," or the scenario of "The Parrot That Talked in Its Sleep." If your perch turns out to be a hornpout, so much the worse. If your hook engages your finger or your overalls, if any minor mishap calls forth an expletive, then your battery is discharging; you might as well be back in the office. Similar is the effect if your contemplative process turns to the framing of sentences which you hope may convince others that you care less for fish than for the pipe smoked in peace, the kingfisher, the lucky bugs, the glowing thought.

The mushroom may at times be shy, but it is not game. Of all vegetable creatures it succumbs with the least struggle. You must wear plate armor to catch the blackberry. You must call (or imitate) a terrier when you have run the potato to earth. Your grapevine may revert to the arboreal, take to the woods and run up a tree; but the gentle Agaricus remains in the open, and has no speed save in growth. It has only one mode of defence, which is to shelter itself behind the reputation of its cousin Amanita, or the loathly name of toadstool, which it may bear with honesty if without honor. This simple *ruse de guerre* may serve to terrorize those who never pursue mushrooms save in the open market or round the edge of the steak in the platter, but from the most contemplative man's batteries they draw not one volt or one ampere (or whatever the modern equivalents of jot and tittle may be). Nor, indeed, does anything else connected with the pursuit. In fishing, whatever comes to your hook, be it rockweed or rock bass, sends a thrill up your line that draws an answering thrill from your nerves. In the mushroom pasture, the sight of your prey comes with a soft glow of pleasure like that of a happy thought that is instantly at home in the mind. You are not obliged to swallow your susceptibilities for the grasping of a slimy, struggling thing, the tearing of the hook from its vitals, and the inserting of it in the vitals of an equally slimy and even more reluctant earthworm. Your game comes easily to your hand, and therewith you sit on a lichened rock where the scene of sweet-fern and huckleberry steaming from last night's rain comes refreshingly to your nostrils, and pensively remove the earthly taint from the plump convexities.

By the time you have learned to know the creature when you see it, you have learned that excuses for empty hands are works of supererogation. Set out with basket or pail, or even so much as an avowed purpose, and you are lost. One such experience is enough. The next time you slip a folded paper bag into your pocket.

"Where you going, Henry?" This from the voice behind the screen door.

"Over yonder." You wave your hand to at least three points of the compass, intimating that you are merely going walking round your farm. Later, with the bag distended, your pride is to speak casually, rather as if you had found mushrooms and bag together.

"Look here what I found down in the far pasture. Enough for supper, isn't there?"

If unsuccessful, you mention a glimpse of the woodchuck at the south end of the orchard, or submit an exhaustive report on the present state of the Baldwin apple crop. The paper bag lies lost in your hip pocket. Thenceforth, for the duration of the season, it is always with you, for to come upon mushrooms in profusion and be unable to carry them is worse than a cigar ten miles from a match. You may use an unhygienic hat, but it will not hold many, and leaves your crown exposed to the derision of the sun all the way home. A handkerchief, even if you have a clean one, is inadequate save for an individual portion. Coat pockets bring your mushrooms home impregnated with bits of tobacco; trousers pockets reduce them to a moist, unpleasant jelly. You march back to the house. If you do return to the pasture, you find that some other mycophagus, whether with two legs or more, has been there in the interval and trespassed outrageously. But that is before you learn the true recreation.

The gleam of the rounded surface in the midst of the close-cropped grass reminds you of a golf-ball, and you smile at the Chestertonian fancy that your pursuit is like that part of golf from which it differs most, for it is like hunting a lost ball without annoyance, a paradox which of all is the most complete. The annoyance of the lost ball consists (even more than in loss of time from the game of great price) in the feeling that you look like a fool to the others. In mushroom-hunting you need never appear to be seeking anything. You drift hither and yon in the pasture; only the chipmunk eyes you from the wall, and he, whatever he knows, never tells. The searching is done with the outer vision, soon becoming a mere reflex, calming rather than disturbing the central activities of the mind. It is as if the eye carried a pattern which it applies automatically and with inconceivable rapidity to each hand's breadth of the pasture, till suddenly the pattern fits; then your feet are drawn, seemingly without volition, to where the little umbrellas are spread or the tiny buttons pushing up through the earth. Unless you wish, you are not conscious of looking ever downward. You are placidly aware of the cloud chariots and the shapes of the hills; you mark the strife of crow and kingbird, and the poise of the hawk. If a few mushrooms escape, you are none the wiser, for, in the vernacular phrase, "what you don't know won't hurt you." Besides, you are an amateur; you have made no boast; you have no score to hand in, no competitor—if you have a helper that is not my affair, for the possibilities of mushroom-hunting *à deux* are too great for the scope of this discussion.

"He knows all the smells of the grass," said a four-year-old neighbor of my terrier, as the dog coursed imaginary scent over the lawn. So the mushroom-seeker knows all the secrets of the herbage of his home pastures: cinquefoil, strawberry leaf, quartz, crystal, and the runways of the ants. Such things are worth marking, for you find they give joy to the inner eye measurable with that from the larger aspects of nature. This love of the minute beauties is the clear gain of the hunter of mushrooms, an addition to his resources of pleasure that other hunters miss more often than not. By contrast, too, it adds to the glory of the hills when you lift your eyes to them. Rank after rank they fade away into the haze, hanging like faint and fainter veils of purple, violet, and lavender, in curve and color like layers of smoke in a still room. The sun slopes to meet its western hilltop, opening through the cloud curtains silvery vistas that carry the eye and the spirit far into the ethereal spaces. To them the earth-born Agaricus has led you, and beholding them you may experience the nearest approach to complete re-creation as yet known to the contemplative—or most contemplative—mind.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Correspondence

The Settlement of Ireland

London, August 22

AT the beginning of the war Viscount Grey himself pronounced Ireland to be "the one bright spot" in the international situation. It seemed at that time that only some incredible folly could prevent such a speedy reconciliation as would make "the United Kingdom" no longer a ghastly misnomer for the British Isles. Objectors to our participation in the Continental struggle were reminded that here, at least, was one substantial boon already gained from it. The war is now over, and one of the fruits of victory is an Ireland not technically, indeed, under martial law, but really in military occupation like a subject country, and requiring twice as many troops to keep a semblance of order as were necessary five years ago. Out of the 105 representatives it has elected to the House of Commons no less than 73 are avowed Republicans, who refuse to take their seats because they cannot subscribe to the oath of allegiance.

There is no need to recapitulate here the story of the blunders that led to the Dublin rebellion of Easter, 1916. A second chance of peace came with the National Convention, where a largely representative body attempted to work out together an acceptable scheme of government and discussed the whole problem for several months without the utterance of a single harsh or discourteous word. The Convention agreed, either unanimously or by large majorities, to a series of resolutions on all the fundamental points of a constitution except the principle of the control of Irish customs and excise. But the opportunity thus offered was thrown away. A fatal step was taken when the Government allied with its proposals of a moderate Home Rule plan a measure of compulsory military service. Eagerly as the Irish people desired self-government, they would not take it when it came to them in the form of a bribe to induce them to swallow conscription. The "striking quickly and hard" policy of the new executive had the results that might have been predicted. The withdrawal of the Nationalist members from Westminster was only one of many signs of the disaffection thereby produced in quarters where a spirit of goodwill had been gradually superseding the old alienation. Since then, things have steadily gone from bad to worse. With Ireland there has not yet been even an armistice, much less a treaty of peace.

Two special features of the Government's policy during the last few months have further embittered national feeling. There has been the license it has allowed to Sir Edward Carson, whose incitements to sedition have been officially extenuated on the ground that his speech, being concerned with purely hypothetical action, had nothing in it that would justify legal proceedings—a defence that has been blown to pieces by Lord Justice O'Connor's exposition of the Treason Felony Act at the Cork Assizes. And there has been the appointment of Brigadier-General Hacket Pain, formerly chief of the staff of the Carson Volunteers, to the command of the forces in the Northern District. Could anything more crazy have been devised than the conferment upon a man with this record of the authority to prohibit political meetings and processions? All this coercion, extending as it does to some of the commonplace details of everyday life—it is forbidden, for instance, for any one in Ireland to keep a motor-bicycle unless his political opinions are approved by the authorities—comes at a time when the British Empire has been formally endorsing the principle of self-determination for small nationalities.

Meanwhile, there stands upon the statute-book a Home Rule Act, passed after one of the most strenuous controversies in which the British Parliament has ever been engaged. But for the war it would have come into effect years ago, but its operation has been postponed until six months after the date at which we shall be officially certified to be enjoying a complete peace. Nowadays that event is beginning to seem as hypothetical as Sir Edward Carson's establishment of his Provisional Government, but in any case the Home Rule Act is, by almost universal consent, as dead as a door-nail. Ireland would not give a thank-ye for it now. The Lord Chancellor remarked the other day that there are not twelve constituencies that would vote for the Home Rule Act today. It is the story of the Sibyl's books over again. The minimum that would now be acceptable must give much larger powers of self-government, notably as regards fiscal autonomy. An agitation for a better measure has been started by *The Times*. Almost simultaneously, a group of Irishmen, many of them men of individual distinction and all of them persons of influence in their respective spheres, have formed themselves into an Irish Dominion League, with Sir Horace Plunkett as their chief spokesman. Never before, with the exception of the Convention, has so widely-representative a body of Irishmen united in drawing up a plan of settlement. Both the *Times* scheme and the League manifesto have, doubtless, been reproduced in America, and there is no need to summarize them here. There are three main differences to be noted. In the first place, the *Times* plan is of English origin, whereas that of the League appeals to Irishmen as a purely native product. Second, while both schemes largely follow the precedents set in the constitutions of the Overseas Dominions, the *Times* plan contains a proviso that the central authority, legislative and executive, is to have only such powers as may eventually be delegated to it by the Provincial Legislatures. It would therefore—the supporters of the Plunkett scheme point out—be in the power of the Ulster Provincial Assembly to prevent the new constitution from functioning at all, not only in Ulster but in any part of Ireland, should that Assembly wish to bring about a deadlock, e. g., by vetoing a budget.

Both schemes have been sympathetically discussed in the English press, but it must be confessed that the average Englishman is by no means so concerned about the subject as he should be. He is really sick to death of Ireland, and just now he has so many things to attend to that seem to him of more vital importance. The one encouraging sign is that many of the younger members of the Unionist party—men like the brothers Cecil and Colonel Aubrey Herbert—are shaking themselves loose from all association with Carsonism and are approaching very nearly to an attitude of frank endorsement of the Nationalist demands. The great danger at present arises from the levity of the Government, which is still content to drift idly along. The Prime Minister in his three hours' speech on the eve of the Parliamentary recess could not find time for a word about Ireland. Every day's procrastination makes it less likely that even the Plunkett scheme will satisfy a national spirit that is rapidly hardening into implacable hostility. One wonders how many more of the Sibyl's books will yet be burnt.

HERBERT W. HORWILL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chinese Drawings

By WITTER BYNNER

A Vendor of Rose-Bushes

I am very poor.
Anyone who can buy from me
Ought to do it.

An Artist

He cannot paint
The growth of the spirit,
But he can paint an old man
Watching the smoke of incense
Join the sky.

A Lady

She does not see the tea her servant brings
Into the garden.
Her hands have fallen down from the instrument
She was playing,
But the strings can still answer
The cold fingers of autumn.

A Scholar

Having won his diploma
He rides a horse of air
Through ten miles of the color
Of apricot-blossoms.

A Philosopher

What though they conquer us?
In at most nine hundred years
Someone will conquer them.

A Horseman

Beyond him are many inlets curving among mountains
And on the way a temple,
And there is gold on the harness of his horse
Whose head and foot are uplifted together.
But the rider sits quiet now,
As he rides toward the shadow
Of the second willow.

In the Driftway

THE Boston police strike makes the Drifter wonder what would happen if the variegated police of Shanghai should strike? With four brands of police (none of them Chinese) in sight on some street corners, one seems wrapped in a fourfold majesty of law. Where can one find equal protection? The foreigner feels safe behind this private guard —and so does the criminal: he may rob his man in the Chinese quarter, pursue and murder him in the French concession, leap a wall and seek sanctuary in the British. The little French Annamese policeman may not follow beyond his own corner; the haughty British Sikh has no concern over crimes not committed in his quarter. After studying the various uniforms and their wearers, the Drifter concluded it would be prudent to side with the Sikh. Superb giants they are, with their brilliant red turbans covering their long hair, and their curly beards carefully parted, rolled under the chin and neatly twisted over the ears! The Drifter avoided those flashing black eyes while he reflected on Britain's cleverness in making guardians of the peace of those whom Nature had so evidently designed for desperadoes. And now imagine a police strike in Shanghai! Picture the sad case of those pallid foreigners on the Bund left to the mercies of the Chinese they despise! Suppose all the police, brown, yellow, and white, should unite in refusing to play watchdog in these strangers' yards. What a cry would then go up for machine guns! Would the foreigners pack up their concessions and their privileges and go home? Or would the slow fever of chronic intervention that has sapped China break out with the virulence of a plague?

* * * * *

THE Drifter was in Shantung when official mourning was decreed for the first President of the Chinese Republic. There was no precedent for such an event, but at the suggestion of foreign advisers, strips of black cloth were tied on the arms of the puzzled soldiers—foreign mourning had appeared in China. The Drifter wonders if a black rag is still adequate to express the Shantung state of mind.

* * * * *

EVERY one knows of Eddie Rickenbacker, and Barney Oldfield is a name by no means dim, though flying has a little obscured mere motoring for the moment; but how many memories responded, the Drifter wonders, to the news that Budd Doble has just died in California? Yet as a captain of speed he was the equal of either Rickenbacker or Oldfield, if not in the velocity he attained at least in his eminence in the career he followed. For he was one of the greatest drivers of harness horses alive between the Civil War and the War with Spain. Indeed, he may be called a classic figure, made so in a modest way as far back as the Centennial by Holmes's "How the Old Horse Won the Bet":

> 'Twas on the famous trotting ground,
> The betting men were gathered round
> From far and near; the "cracks" were there
> Whose deeds the sporting prints declare:
> The swift g. m., Old Hiram's nag,
> The fleet s. h., Dan Pfeiffer's brag,
> With these a third—and who is he
> That stands beside his fast b. g.?
> Budd Doble, whose catarrhal name
> So fills the nasal trump of fame.

Alas for that "catarrhal name," latterly so well forgotten! The very thought reminds the Drifter how right the poets are in their claim to be the only true immortality-makers. Of their own guild they keep the records, and of kings and warriors and a few priests, today exactly as in the age of skalds and druids. Let us revive the ancient paradox that it is not kings and warriors and priests who make history —or even, as we now more democratically say, the people themselves—but the poets, who choose what is to survive. Things past and lost are as non-existent as a sound where there is no ear to hear it or as light where there is no eye to see it. Budd Doble in his little hour of thirty years was known to more persons, no doubt, than was Holmes. And yet Holmes now preserves him—Holmes and the Drifter. At least Budd Doble, catarrhal even to the end, is better off than most of his rivals. To adapt Pope:

> Vain was the Jockey's, Racer's Pride!
> They had no Poet, and they died.
> In vain they whipped, in vain they sped!
> They had no poet, and are dead.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

The Golden Rule from Shantung

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Three thousand years ago there came into pagan morality a precept which was afterwards expressed by Confucius of Shantung in the words: "Do not unto others what you would not they should do unto you." This rule, adopted by Christ into his system of religion as a part of the law and the prophets, has, as the rule of life, or Golden Rule, been preached if not practiced by millions. It is the one rule of conduct of those uttered by Christ (erstwhile criticised as a communist) that has been accepted as unquestionably workable between individuals, if not certainly workable between nations.

This rule if existent in heathen morality should certainly be considered as binding on all western civilization, but the effort of China to prevent among its people the frightful evils of the opium drug was frustrated by the English who supplied it; the nefarious traffic was secured for the British merchants by force in the Opium War of 1840. No rule would be applied then that might deprive the merchants of an enormous source of wealth and the Indian Government of revenue. The rule was not with the British.

Is the rule with us? Let me quote an idea from William Allen White, a clear thinker, who, writing in *The Atlantic Monthly* in 1905, said that in all the philosophies of life, in all the systems of government, in all the schemes of industry which have flourished on this planet, only that is vital which has had in it some obedience to the rule; this inspires the faith that the country that follows the law shall live.

But White had not heard of the Shantung outrage. Obversely, may we not now say that a country which ignores that law shall die?

Is the rule with us? Let me quote Ernest DeWitt Burton, the distinguished New Testament professor of the University of Chicago, who, in *The Biblical World* of March, 1918, asks "Is the Golden Rule Workable Between Nations?" and concludes: "Rarely in the history of the world, it is safe to affirm, have practical state papers put forth at a critical moment in national affairs been written on the high moral level of Lloyd George's recent definition of the aims of Great Britain, or the Golden Rule as a principle of statecraft and international policy been so clearly and unequivocally set forth as in the address [the Fourteen Points speech] which President Wilson delivered to Congress Tuesday, January 8. . . . The Golden Rule is workable between nations. It will yet become the recognized law of nations."

But Burton had not heard of the Shantung outrage.

Chicago, September 10 GILBERT G. OGDEN

Publicity with a Big "P"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It may interest you to hear that a bill has been introduced by Senator Cummins for the creation of a permanent Federal Publicity Bureau, consisting of a paid Director of Publicity and the members of the Cabinet acting *ex officio*. Its functions will include the preparation and distribution of advertising "intended to secure recruits for the Army and Navy" and the planting of such other "advertising or publicity as may be required by any other departments of the Federal Government." The bureau will also give free advice to business houses on the possibilities and methods of foreign advertising, and will "suggest and conduct advertising and publicity campaigns in various foreign countries to promote prestige and public favor in said various foreign countries for American colleges, institutions, merchandise, and service of all kinds which it is desired to promote abroad."

The field of governmental publicity, you may have observed, has expanded perceptibly as a result of our participation in the World War. In a few short months the new type of governmental publicity made a tolerant, peace-loving nation hate and persecute to a degree thitherto considered impossible of attainment. It set up Fourteen Points on a firm base of world-wide approval; then impaled the Hun neatly on every one of them—though it must be admitted that the world-wide approval has not been quite so world-wide in the last instance. It has made Tyrolese long to become Italian, Italian yearn to become Jugoslav, Jugoslav desperate to become some other sort of Slav. It has maintained a constant and scientific correlation between Bolshevist unwillingness to pay French bondholders and Bolshevist atrocities against humanity. Without the modern type of state advertising, untrained public opinion might find some discrepancy between self-determination for Silesia and American approval for the theft of Shantung. Except by the exaltation born of state advertising, could this generation of American parents be expected generously to consecrate its male infants, born and unborn, to the sacred cause of defending with their blood French rights in the Saar Valley? The suggestion is preposterous, as is, for further example, the hope that without state advertising what was a few months ago a victorious war to abolish war and conscription the world over should become overnight the excuse for the perpetuation of forced military service in America and the occasion for the revision upward of our military establishment by fifteen hundred per cent.

The only objection, in fact, to the Cummins bill will come from economists and experts in taxation. What need, they will ask, is there for paying the American press to do what it has proved only too willing to do without fee or promise of favor?

Mt. Vernon, N. Y., August 6 B.

Questionable Questioning

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your recent editorials on Mexico receive a singular justification from the way in which the investigation of Mexican conditions is now being conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Sub-Committee, consisting of Senator Fall, Senator Brandegee and Senator Smith of Arizona.

During the last three days, three members of the committee on Mexico of the League of Free Nations Association have appeared before the Senate Sub-Committee. These witnesses were Dr. S. G. Inman, executive secretary of the Society for Co-operation in Latin America; Dr. G. B. Winton of Nashville, Tenn., for years in charge of Methodist missionary schools in Mexico; and myself, as chairman of our committee on Mexico.

The public utterances of all the members of the Senate Sub-Committee and particularly the notorious attitude of Senator Fall towards Mexican intervention would, without further evidence, do much to discredit in the eyes of unbiased Americans the investigations of this Senate Committee. I am sure, however, that few Americans would be prepared for the atmosphere which characterized the hearing of the last few days. Mr. Edward L. Doheny, of the Huasteca Petroleum Company, one of the largest of the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, and Harold Walker, counsel for the Mexican Petroleum Company, were, together with their eight or nine assistants, in constant consultation with Senator Fall and with the Senate Sub-Committee's counsel and special investigator during Senator Fall's questioning of the witnesses.

Surely it is high time if there must be an investigation of Mexican conditions that it be made by a committee which is not prejudiced against the Carranza régime and which does not give so many evidences of friendship and understanding with American business interests hostile to the only Government which promises to maintain peace and order in Mexico, and to provide for the gradual amelioration of the social and economic despotism of the Diaz régime.

New York, September 12 JAMES G. MCDONALD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CLARK COLLEGE
SENECA, OHIO

Mexico's Recovery

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I can't begin to tell you how I value *The Nation*. I send every copy to someone here in Mexico. . . . After five years away from the country, and eleven years' absence from the capital, I am so full of joy over the country's recovery, over all it has done without much help from abroad, over the manifest hope, self-confidence, and initiative its people display, that I am impatient with American and English alike who want to fill my ears with tales of ancient atrocities and military rascalities, which could be matched the world over.

Mexico has been my home for twenty years. I love the country and its people. There were times when it was hard to accept Carranza's judgment, but truly he knew his people when he let them wait till their rich old Mother Earth gave them her breast again. The Carranza Government, in spite of all hindrance, has held the country wonderfully steady, and seems to have made fewer mistakes than most governments.

I hope you see *El Heraldo* with its English page, which recently published Salvador Alvarado's fine letter.

Surely never did I see so much beautiful building in progress as here. There is a proposed large American school for which a fine site has been given in one of the beautiful colonies that lie towards Chapultepec. I am anxious that they may make the building truly a house for children, not a mediæval castle nor Elizabethan manor house. The human material of the school is fine, children and faculty, especially the principal, Mrs. Bowen, a pupil of Col. Francis W. Parker. The school would have died during the hard years if the Mexicans had not sent their children to it, and yet I grieve to find that Americans would now exclude the Mexicans if they could.

This has been a wonderful summer in the capital, with its charming environs. What a peaceful life it is by comparison with that of our brothers in Washington, Chicago, Budapest, Petrograd, Eastern Siberia, India!

City of Mexico, August 27 F. M.

Mexican Appreciation

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I want to thank you very sincerely for the attitude of fairness and justice that you have adopted in your paper towards Mexico.

I am a Mexican woman studying at the University of Chicago, and I am convinced of the great value rendered by simply telling the truth and opposing a certain type of information, which surpasses the limits of all supposition in lack of honesty. The only way to oppose the interests of some financial magnates of my country is to bring the facts to the knowledge of the people and create currents of understanding between both nations.

Chicago, September 6 A. Z.

Encore!

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am rejoicing at the success of the Actors' Equity Association. It is indeed time that the interpreters of the dramatic art have thrown off the yoke of commercial exploitation. To the actors belongs the presentation of plays. The managers are entitled to remuneration for their services in production, not for utilizing human beings in a business enterprise. The stand of the cultured striking actors smacks of Soviet Russia. It is delightful! Their position makes clear the difference between slavery and social interdependence. Being young, I am optimistic. Methinks the time is coming when other slaves will free their souls!

Ithaca, N. Y., September 5 Henry Roenne

Literature

The Tasks of Reconstruction

Collapse and Reconstruction; European Conditions and American Principles. By Thomas Barclay. Little Brown and Company.

Democratic Ideals and Reality; A Study in the Politics of Reconstruction. By H. J. Mackinder. Henry Holt and Company.

Problems of Reconstruction. By Isaac Lippincott. The Macmillan Company.

The Vision for Which We Fought; A Study in Reconstruction. By A. M. Simons. The Macmillan Company.

The Great Alternative; Saner Politics or Revolution. By Leonard J. Reid. Longmans, Green and Company.

Democracy in Reconstruction. Edited by Frederick A. Cleveland and Joseph Schafer. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Reconstruction and National Life. By Cecil Fairfield Lavell. The Macmillan Company.

BOOKS of the most varied quality continue to pour from the presses to meet the demand everywhere for information and guidance in the era of reconstruction which the world is facing. Some are optimistic and others not so. For downright pessimism most must yield to Sir Thomas Barclay's "Collapse and Reconstruction." This book—by the author of the well-known "Problems of International Practice and Diplomacy"—was written, at least in the main, before the armistice. But it is not clear that it would bear a different aspect had it been produced within the past three months. Indeed, the tone of despair that runs through it might well have been heightened by the many untoward happenings in Paris since April or May. Taking the President's fourteen points as "the generally accepted basis of the new international order," the author gives us essentially a commentary on them, from an English viewpoint, with copious historical and analytical notes. His attitude is sympathetic, yet skeptical. He would like to believe that a world can be organized and run on the lines which Mr. Wilson laid down, but he cannot overcome his doubts about it. He believes that the war was continued "beyond any practical purpose"; that "if western governments had not had their eyes concentrated on Berlin, they might have understood, as all who know central Europe politically understand, that if the overtures of February, 1915, from Vienna had been followed up, the war might have come to an end just as it did with the Austrian collapse in 1918, without bringing down on the heads of all the scaffolding of a state system laboriously built up by generation after generation of experienced craftsmen and resting on geographical and historical foundations which it is beyond the power of any congress of peace to alter." The outlook for permanent peace is considered dubious, and this *before* the three or four necessary conditions of such a peace as the author develops were, without exception, transgressed in the German treaty.

The scholarly reserve which appears on every page of Sir Thomas Barclay's volume is less characteristic of Mr. Mackinder's book, which, while dealing also with the fundamentals of politics, strikes into a different portion of the field and arrives at more heartening conclusions. It is concerned, not with programmes and "points," but with the geographical and physical background of national developments and of international rivalries. The unequal growth of nations, we are told, is "in large measure the result of the uneven distribution of fertility and strategical opportunity upon the face of our globe." The grouping of lands and seas, and of fertile areas and natural pathways, it is further asserted, "is such as to lend itself to the growth of empires, and in the end of a single World Empire." And the author concludes that if we are to realize the ideal of a League of Nations which shall prevent war, we must recognize these geographical realities and take steps to offset their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence. How this is to be done is told in much detail in a half-dozen readable chapters. There is a good deal that is fanciful, not to say fantastic, in the argument; and there is an undue propensity for novel words and phrases. None the less, the volume cannot be denied a place among the three or four best books in English on the relations of history and geography.

Perhaps the most fundamental of reconstruction problems is the attitude that government is to take toward economic organization and activity. Under the stress of war, the regulative powers of government in all belligerent countries have been stretched to lengths hitherto unknown. Money, labor, food, shipping, fuel, man-power—all have been mobilized under conditions that could mean nothing less than thoroughgoing control by the state. The methods and processes differed in various lands, but the object was the same and the effect at least broadly similar. How much control is to be relaxed completely? How much is to be continued, and through what agencies? These and similar questions loom constantly before the reader of Professor Lippincott's book. The volume was written before the cessation of hostilities, and there is no attempt at idle prophecy. The history, however, of war control in certain parts of the economic field, and mainly in the United States, is narrated, the economic results of the war are tentatively appraised, the earlier steps toward reconstruction in England, France, and other European countries are succinctly described, and a reconstruction plan for the United States is briefly developed. In so far as the book is historical, it is very satisfactory. It is written largely from the sources, it is scrupulously accurate, and it reads well. The chapter on the difficult subject of the economic results of the war is especially to be commended.

In so far as the book aims at constructive suggestions, it is less adequate. The chapter which assumes to develop a reconstruction plan for the United States really gets little farther than to say again that the reconstruction problem in this country is multiform and to suggest the creation of special reconstruction machinery whose principal feature should be a central commission of perhaps fifteen persons, including two representatives of each branch of Congress, with a number of sub-committees having to do with finance, foreign trade, transportation, labor, and other great public interests and questions. Doubtless it was too early when Mr. Lippincott wrote to formulate a more definite reconstruction programme; and it was abundantly worth while to call the attention of our people to the fact that the framers of our public policy have lagged shamefully behind the statesmen and industrial leaders of Europe in bringing the reconstruction problem under systematic examination. Several bills for a national reconstruction commission have made their appearance in Washington. No one of them, however, meets Mr. Lippincott's approbation, principally because all of them contemplate a commission made up exclusively of senators and congressmen. Mr. Lippincott shows with unimpeachable logic that the body should consist mainly of persons actively engaged in leading industrial and scientific activities; and his argument for policies based on the most painstaking research, rather than on snap judgments or preconceived opinions, is properly as strong as it can be made.

In "The Vision for which We Fought" Mr. Simons similarly calls for a reconstruction which shall be no less comprehensively and intelligently guided than was the war itself, and the object of which shall be the "establishment of democracy upon the ruins of autocracy throughout every social institution"—in other words, the realization of the vision for which men and women sacrificed and suffered through four long years. Unless, he says, all of our talk about a death-grapple between autocracy and democracy was but sounding brass to rally the tribe to battle, the war is not to be considered won until this vision has become a reality. "We must mobilize for peace as we mobilized for war. Above all else, we must mobilize our intelligence."

Mr. Simons writes specifically for Americans. Mr. Leonard J. Reid's "The Great Alternative" is, on the other hand, a book by an Englishman addressed exclusively to Englishmen. Mr. Reid is one of the many thoughtful men in England who have feared that as a result of the chaos into which English politics and industrial life have fallen the country will soon find the control of its affairs contested by only two parties: on the one hand, a powerfully organized Labor party, with a great programme of state socialism and general equalization, and, on the other, a party of reaction representing the forces of capital, tradition, and privilege. In this contingency "a disastrous clash cannot but result," with probably a subversion of the entire social order. Is this to be permitted to come about? Or will the great body of true liberals in the country—a body not at all identical with "the moribund party which before the war called itself Liberal"—come together in a great mediating, balancing organization whose influence will be sufficient to avert social chaos? This is "the great alternative." Mr. Reid's book is a well-seasoned plea for a mighty and immediate upbuilding of the New Liberalism. In a series of chapters on the distribution of wealth, on the relations of the state to industry, on profit-sharing, land, housing, trade policy, education, health, and politics, he seeks to point out the large and necessary steps that must be taken if a sane progressivism rather than a wild revolutionism is to prevail. As a book by a man in the street, written for men of sound sense who make no claim to the name of expert, the volume is to be commended without reserve. Its influence will undoubtedly be considerable and cannot fail to be wholesome.

Under the joint editorship of Dr. Frederick A. Cleveland and Professor Joseph Schafer a score of essays have been brought together in a useful handbook entitled "Democracy in Reconstruction." Mr. Schafer contributes an introductory survey of the historical background of reconstruction in America and shows that the history of this country is happily such that the work of reconstruction, instead of constituting a violent break with the past, may be simply a continuation of developments already under way before the war, somewhat accelerated and newly emphasized. "The most hopeful development," he says, "is the new social consciousness which has come into existence partly in consequence of the war, and which is rapidly unifying the demand for a sane, evolutionary, but unequivocally liberal solution of the economic and social problems of American life." Under six general heads—ideals of democracy, institutions of democracy, social problems, labor problems, transportation problems, and political problems—more than a dozen different writers, all recognized experts upon their subjects, set forth the sailent needs and tasks of the reconstruction epoch. All of the essays converge upon the idea that the reign of democracy and of social justice must be more fully established. Like most books prepared on the coöperative plan, the volume shows large gaps, and is of uneven quality. There is as yet, however, probably no single book from which the average citizen of intelligence can get a more vivid impression of the many-sidedness, the high responsibilities, and the fascinating nature of the coming work of reconstruction in this country.

Reconstruction is, of course, a matter of laws and offices and statistics and other coldly practical things. But it is also a matter of ideals, and the greatest calamity that could befall would be the failure of our political and industrial leaders to be inspired in the coming years by large vision. Like Mr. Simons, Professor Lavell, in his "Reconstruction and National Life," places the emphasis squarely upon idealism. He has little to say about the concrete tasks that loom ahead, but he traces the history of idealism in modern times in four principal countries—England, France, Germany, and Russia—and makes some appraisal of the part which liberal thought is prepared to take in these lands in shaping the political and economic policies of the coming age. His book is a useful summary; although what the world stands in greater need of today is a work that will really link up the idealism of a bygone age with the colossal practical problems of an urgent present. This neither Mr. Lavell's book nor any other volume in the group here reviewed adequately does.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Feudal Quakers

Political Leaders of Provincial Pennsylvania. By Isaac Sharpless. The Macmillan Company.

THIS is an admirable book. Though cast in the form of a series of biographies, it is in reality an excellent introduction to the history of provincial Pennsylvania by a thoroughly competent authority. Of the eight leaders discussed, four—William Penn, Thomas Lloyd, James Logan, and David Lloyd—belong to the "turbulent age of infancy," 1682-1726; two—John Kinsey and James Pemberton—to the high-water era of pure Quaker domination, 1726-1756; and two—Isaac Norris and John Dickinson—to the later years of conflict with the proprietors, 1756-1774, when the Friends, led by Norris and Franklin and aided by the Germans and some of the Scotch-Irish, opposed the Penns and their governors, who were supported by many of the wealthy Anglicans of Philadelphia. The periods are well marked in the political history of the province, for the year 1726 saw the arrival of Governor Patrick Gordon, "a wise old man who seemed to harmonize the hitherto conflicting claims of proprietor and assembly"; and the year 1756 saw the voluntary withdrawal of the Friends from political leadership and the yielding of their control into the hands of others with less marked religious scruples. Perhaps in the history of no other colony in America could the issues at stake be so satisfactorily presented through the medium of biography.

Of the three periods none has been the subject of more controversy or has given rise to a greater display of partisanship than that in which David Lloyd—of the same race and fighting instinct as his namesake of today, David Lloyd George—carried on the battle for the rights and privileges of the assembly against Penn and his agent, James Logan. It is not clear that even President Sharpless sees the ultimate cause of the controversy. He calls the conflict "largely a politician's fight," in which "the body of Friends seemed to be interested spectators ready to turn the scale in favor of one side or the other as errors of 'falsehood or malignity' withdrew their sympathy," and he doubts whether "they very intelligently cared for the political and civil liberties which Lloyd so strenuously urged."

It may be so, but in any case our author fails to point out that these early quarrels, which brought Penn's "Holy Experiment" so near to failure, had their origin, not in the fighting zest of politicians, but in the anomaly of a Quaker's attempting to establish an ideal system of government under the ægis of a feudal charter. This charter, with its proprietary prerogatives, class distinctions, and feudal incidents and practices, made Penn an absolute lord and landed proprietor and vested in him rights and powers that were strange attributes for a Quaker, and wholly foreign to the principles that he had always professed. Why, with his lofty ideals of government and apparent sympathy for "democracy," as understood in his day, Penn should have been willing to receive such a charter from the hand of the King or have made no attempt to modify its provisions in the interest of the Sidneyesque principles in which he believed, has never been satisfactorily explained. Perhaps the truth lies in the fact that Penn was at bottom an aristocrat and a courtier and accepted this vice-regal office and these vice-regal powers with the idea of granting, as had other absolute proprietors before him, an octroyed frame of government, designed with the best intentions in the world to meet the expectations of the people who had been attracted to his colony by the promises he had made.

But octroyed constitutions—whether as "concessions and agreements" or "frames of government"—were not popular in colonial America, and proprietary benevolence, no matter how inspired with reverence for the common good, was sure to fail as a permanent foundation for a "free colony." With Penn, the patriarchal head of his province, in England, and his deputies, Markham, Blackwell, Evans, and Gookin, men of the world and not of the inner light, serving him in America, it is little wonder that the first years should have been a time of bitterness and conflict or that a David Lloyd should have arisen to establish the supremacy of a representative assembly in Pennsylvania, much as the leaders of the Revolution and their successors in England eventually established there the dominance of the House of Commons. President Sharpless does not seem to realize that the Charter of Liberties of 1701, which reduced the council to an advisory body and created a free assembly with full liberty to make laws, was the first great defeat for the proprietary. This constitution, the work mainly of David Lloyd and John Moore, the Anglican, was not freely granted by Penn; it was forced upon him against his will.

President Sharpless does, however, see that David Lloyd was neither a crafty politician nor an artful demagogue, nor even "a base man" to be rewarded "according to his villany" for "obstinately maintaining the wrong theory," as Penn once said of him. He believes that Lloyd's influence largely secured to the people of Pennsylvania "the invaluable right of an independent legislature" and contributed to the "interests of the larger democracy and prosperity of the colony." He also believes that had Penn been continuously present in the colony "certain aristocratic features and social customs might have been engrafted on the government less favorable to liberty than such as were worked out through the stress of partisan conflict." These are large concessions, which, coming from so high an authority, are certain to embarrass those who unqualifiedly defend Penn's governmental methods and see no contradiction between his faith and his works.

In two other respects, President Sharpless clarifies our knowledge of the situation in colonial Pennsylvania. He brings out very suggestively the clan-relationship of the Quaker leaders, and explains admirably the meaning of "Quaker rule," in the province after 1756. Except for Penn, David Lloyd, and John Kinsey, all the leaders were closely connected by blood or marriage, forming a single large family, composed of Reads, Prestons, Hillses, Lloyds, Logans, Norrises, Pembertons, Dickinsons, and others. This Quaker governing class maintained an easy control until 1756, because of the personal character and training of its members and because of the well-organized system which they developed chiefly through the local, regional, and general annual assemblies of their religious bodies. But after 1756 this Quaker control underwent a transformation. In explaining what this transformation was, President Sharpless shows, as perhaps no one not himself a Quaker could do, that an important distinction is to be drawn between those who were Quakers in membership and those who, though often called Quakers, were not so in principle, inasmuch as they were generally willing to compromise on such questions as war and self-defence. Thus of the eight leaders here mentioned, only Penn, Thomas Lloyd, John Kinsey, and James Pemberton were, strictly speaking, Quakers; the others—David Lloyd, James Logan, Isaac Norris, and John Dickinson—were only Quakers by affiliation.

This distinction is essential to an understanding of what is meant by "Quaker rule" after 1756. Government lay in the hands of the same class, but the leaders were no longer the strict Quakers of the preceding period. Among these leaders were Norris and Dickinson, who appeared to be Quakers only because they took affirmations rather than oaths and belonged to Quaker families. They were never members of the society and at critical junctures rejected testimony, deciding in favor of the state rather than the church. They led a combination of religious and racial groups, joined together, not for the maintenance of Quaker principles, but for the defence of the province, a country party as opposed to the proprietary party. Properly speaking, Quaker rule in Pennsylvania ended with the opening of the Seven Years' War, and was never recovered.

All of these biographies are interesting and informing, but the one that will prove most revealing to the general reader is, we venture to think, the biography of John Dickinson, who as the famous author of the "Farmer's Letters" has been to most people little more than a name and a symbol.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chinese Lore

The Encyclopedia Sinica. By Samuel Couling. Oxford University Press.

THE author of this book, which was published in 1917 but only lately brought to the notice of scholars in this country, was for many years engaged in educational work at the English Baptist Mission and at the Union Christian Shantung University. Latterly he has given himself to the arduous task of preparing what should be a hand-book of Chinese lore and a much-needed book of reference. It is doubtful if any man now in China is better fitted than Mr. Couling for attempting such a task. He is fitted by temper, by zeal for laborious investigation, and by lucidity and conciseness of style, as well as by the power to discriminate between what to leave out and what to include. He has been ably seconded by his gifted wife and by various scholars, British, French, and American, with special qualifications in particular lines. He was greatly aided by the "famous Library" of Dr. G. E. Morrison, which, the author says, was "the best in the world for my purpose." This library, unfortunately, has been removed from Peking to Tokio, where it has become the possession of Baron Iwasaki.

In his preface, Mr. Couling admits that his title for so small a book seems to demand apology or explanation, but expresses the hope that there will be succeeding editions which may deserve the name better. As to the size of this first attempt at something encyclopedic as well as Chinese, the author need not be ashamed. One may wonder whether any more or better sinologues than those in the past can be produced in the rushing life to which the world now looks forward for a good many years to come. The book contains condensed articles on topics purely scientific, scholarly, and technical, such as Archæology, Archery, Architecture, Botany in China, Bronze, Geology, Lexicography (which is one of the most comprehensive articles), Meteorology, Minerals, Music, and Musical Instruments. These and kindred topics are treated by specialists, several of them from the Jesuit Mission in Zi-ka-wei, Shanghai. There are also many historical matters discussed. Here it can have been no easy task for the author to decide on what to eliminate. We find most useful articles on the aborigines of China, on the different dynasties, ancient states, provinces, and most important cities of China, on the Arrow War, the Opium War, the Boxer Uprising, the Audience Question, the Rites Controversy, and Secret Societies. There are comprehensive but condensed articles on the relations with China of other countries, Russia, Japan, Great Britain, Holland, and the United States. There are many shorter articles touching on the governmental systems, past and present, of the Chinese, and on various political events and revolutions, but strange to say, there is nothing on the Chinese Republic, while the article on the four revolutions since 1911 is very short. Most of the historical references appear in articles on noted personalities. In this department the book is particularly full and varied.

It is also extremely useful in the information it gives about the religious and educational work of different churches, Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Russian, of all the nationalities represented. Dr. Couling, an Englishman writing in a time of war, allows no national bias or passion to impair his sense of proportion or to make him deny recognition to good done or give *ex parte* testimony. Evidently he is a Christian and a scholar as well as a loyal Briton. Thus he—or rather his wife—gives to the reader a true and fair outline of the work of the Basel Missionary Society, of the Rhenish Missionary Society, of the Berlin Mission, and of the Steyl Mission—the last-named being Catholic and German or Austrian in the province of Shantung though its chief seminary is at Steyl in Holland.

Every person or association or library desirous of information on many things that relate to China will find this work indispensable. We hope it may expand into other and larger editions, equally trustworthy and true.

Tales of Plain People

The Happy End. By Joseph Hergesheimer. Alfred A. Knopf.
Deep Waters. By W. W. Jacobs. Charles Scribner's Sons.
Little Houses. By George Woden. E. P. Dutton and Company.
Singing Mountains. By A. B. Cunningham. George H. Doran Company.
Lo, And Behold Ye! By Seumas MacManus. Frederick A. Stokes Company.

SOMEWHERE in Hawthorne's note-books there is a passage in which he explains the creative origin of his stories. His initial impulse was never, it seems, to tell something about life, but always to communicate a thought, a fancy, a mood of his own, for which he then proceeded to seek some fitting embodiment in his observation or memory of reality. The outer world was not the theme but the material of his art. That is also true of Mr. Joseph Hergesheimer. He starts with the idea of an artistic effect that he wishes to produce, of a vision that he would share with others. Life furnishes him the brightly colored strands that he weaves into his warm and delicate patterns. The passions of men are but the darker glow for the tapestry upon his loom. He sees far more than he feels; he is, according to Gourmont's useful distinction, a *visuel* rather than an *émotif*. And what, indeed, one carries away from his stories is the image of a frail figure swaying a little under the lamplight of a rude cottage, or the touch of crimson at a Spaniard's waist, or the wistful smile of a lad, or "a girl whose charm, like the flowers, is dust." "Such apparent trifles," Mr. Hergesheimer says in the best and most characteristic of these stories, "often hold a steadfast loveliness more enduring than the greatest tragedies and successes."

His art is delicate, remote, emotionally unemphatic. One does not, for a moment, believe in the imminent duel or the Spaniard's violent death in "The Flower of Spain." One does believe immensely in the fine wrinkles about Gheta's eyes and in the grandiose impassiveness of Mochales. When, as in "Bread," Mr. Hergesheimer attempts to conduct an action to an impressive close amid the realities of contemporary life, the result is absurd. He needs for his material the exotic, the past, or the unfamiliar—all that he can transmute through his reveries into an artistic vision complete within itself. Thus the rude and simple persons of the Virginia mountains (with whom this volume is chiefly concerned)—Hannah Braley and Lemuel Dort and David Kinnemon—are stripped of the ugliness and accident of reality. And thus we remember them in an unique and symbolical attitude that communicates the poetic vision which Mr. Hergesheimer had at heart. In "Rosemary Roselle," a tale of the Civil War, Mr. Hergesheimer's method reaches its culminating point for this volume. The story is not less than exquisite. These "elusive faces in the shadowy mirror of the past" have, indeed, a poignant and enduring loveliness. The imagination dismisses the burning of Richmond as a necessary though subdued decoration, and retains as a real possession those more essential matters—the white frills at Rosemary's elbows and the "pointed little beauty" of her hands.

In the world of contemporary American fiction, moreover, Mr. Hergesheimer's style is a consolation and a stay. It is not so happy when he describes the actions of men or the operations of their minds as when he renders appearance and gesture, form and color. But it is always scrupulous and never less than adequate. At its best it has both exactness and warmth, frugality and richness, a quiet but sustained modulation of its own. He is an artist through and through. As we have not many such, we should forgive him for his lapses and generously sustain him in his successes, which bid fair to become really numerous.

One must, no doubt, rank Mr. W. W. Jacobs as an artist, too. He has clung to his chosen field and method with an extraordinary pertinacity. Cataclysms may shake the earth, but Mr. Jacobs does not change. His sailors ashore are the same in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Deep Waters" that they were long ago in "Odd Craft" and "Salthaven." They are as changeless as his interest in them. There is something both true and philosophical in this long faithfulness of Mr. Jacobs to his themes and methods. For he deals with aspects of human nature that are not deep but that are constant. Rude men ashore have played these practical jokes on one another and have got into these scrapes with their women since the Phœnician rowers went to the Western seas. And the tales of these jokes and scrapes have been a constant source of laughter ever since. They are a part of that unvarying, superficial human comedy of physical mishaps and jealous wives and pay and drink that you can hear about by listening to the man next to you on a ferry or in the gallery of a theatre, and that always seem not to have been invented but to have happened. To such anecdotes Mr. Jacobs gives the form of his dry and spare and unobtrusive art.

"Little Houses" and "Singing Mountains" are both quiet narratives concerning the lives of simple men. The former deals with British working people in a manufacturing town between 1882 and the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, the latter with the contemporary mountaineers of West Virginia. The remarkably instructive difference between the two books is brought out by their very titles. Mr. Woden's people are plain and homespun and live in little houses. They do nothing that is striking, they are of no particular importance, they have no special grace or gift or charm. But from the cumulative knowledge of their sober, restricted, and ordinary lives there arises, without any direct effort on the author's part, a murmur as of eternal things. By sticking to the humble truth Mr. Woden achieves a final effect of largeness and of that fundamental nobility that belongs to the immemorial concrete facts which make up the recurrent experiences of the generations of mankind. Mr. Cunningham is not content to make such a record. To him life has no meaning and no value of its own, no inherent dignity or beauty. He must superimpose on it an endless and doubtful emotionalism. He will not see his people at any of their ordinary or humanly passionate moments, but shows them as constantly reaching out feverishly beyond themselves. They are always being and doing what, according to an antecedent notion of life and conduct, Mr. Cunningham would have them be and do. Fortunately no real people are so hectic in their practice. The result of it all is that Mr. Cunningham, unlike Mr. Woden, never gives the impression of either dignity or truth. The houses in Selbridge are little, the mountains in West Virginia do not sing. Fix your artist's vision long enough and closely enough on the houses of Selbridge and great meanings will arise from them, but fix your attention on singing mountains and you will never see the mountains at all for listening to a music that really never sounds. In other words, unless a novelist is an almost pure artist of the *visuel* type, such as Mr. Hergesheimer, what counts with him, above all, is the character of his vision of life as a whole. The philosophical implications of prose fiction are almost as vitally important as those of the tragic drama, but they are certain to be submerged if fiction, as so often, insists that it can speak no language but that of sentimentalism.

Mr. Seumas MacManus does not tell stories about the peasantry of Donegal. He has listened to his people and heard the stories they tell, and has invented others like them. The tales have an occasional note of strained extravagance and conscious humor that seems a little alien to the genuine folk-tales. But most of them are, for all that, entirely delightful. Here is a world of the imagination in which one can always be at home. It does not compete with reality and hence it never plays one false. Yet it is as native to every heart as the heart's own childhood. And it is full of a deep and marrowy wisdom throughout all its wildness, and the people, amid their most incredible adventures, remain quite touchingly and humbly human. In this fairy world dwells the true romance. All things that happen here are real because none of them are; all hurts can be healed here, and the happy ending is always the artistic one.

Books in Brief

MR. THOMAS F. MILLARD, an American journalist of Shanghai, has added a fourth volume to his works on Far Eastern politics. One who is familiar with the earlier works will know exactly what to expect in "Democracy and the Eastern Question" (Century). In fact, Mr. Millard has been so often criticised for his *ex parte* writings that in the foreword he frankly says "I have not encumbered the book by giving much of the contrary side of events and of the contrary arguments." Thus he presents a narrative of events in the Far East during the past three years in which Japanese policy and conduct is painted in the darkest colors, while China appears entitled to all the world's sympathy and aid. Mr. Millard's attitude thus at once puts upon his guard any one who has the slightest acquaintance with the facts. Much has been done by Japan and by Japanese in China which merits condemnation, not so much because of the acts themselves, for in practically every case Japan has followed the precedents of other powers, but because the Japanese failed to appreciate the new spirit which throbbed in the western world during the Great War and which rendered any exponent of the old diplomacy an object of suspicion and censure. But the American reader is also entitled to a straightforward account of the wretched state of China under the military despotism of her own leaders during the past few years. And this story is only hinted at by Mr. Millard. It would be difficult to find a less informing account of the way in which China entered the war than in his fifth chapter. That Japanese money has been used by military leaders to carry on their wretched operations seems unquestionable. But to blame Japan for all the ills of China strains one's credulity. If, after the restoration of the Mikado in 1868, the Japanese leaders had been as lacking in patriotism and honesty as many of the present leaders and officials of China, Japan would never have gained her present strong position. It is not necessary to argue with Mr. Millard here. If one has other sources of information for the period covered by this book it will be found interesting reading and at times very suggestive. If, however, the reader thinks that from this volume alone he can get an adequate idea of conditions in Japan, China, and Siberia, then he is doomed to considerable disappointment. One positive advance in Mr. Millard's position should be mentioned. Only a few years ago he feared a Japanese attack upon the United States; now he is convinced that Japan "has not the resources to encounter successfully a real power."

WHATEVER Americans may think of John Hay it is evident that he is already regarded by foreigners as the greatest statesman of our time in directing American diplomacy in its new sphere of activity in Asia. A Japanese graduate of Columbia, Shutaro Tommimas, contributes significant testimony to the fulness of this conviction in two essays entitled "The Open-Door Policy and the Territorial Integrity of China" (A. G. Seiler), the first of which frankly credits the open-door policy with being "the masterpiece of American diplomacy." This is interesting to those who imagine a Japan today jealous of our interference with its designs in China. That policy is here shown to have been the element which preserved China at a moment when Great Britain was temporarily effaced as a military power and had committed herself to the spheres-of-influence doctrine for the ultimate partition of the empire. Hay's formula was primarily designed to protect American economic interests, which had then for the first time on any considerable scale expanded across the Pacific. It was not, as so often described, an effort of altruism, nor was it a departure from our traditional policy. It did not at first even appear to be a bar to the continuance of spheres of interest in China. For this reason it was accepted by Russia, Germany, and France—powers that would have declined to agree to any principle limiting the material prospects of their ventures there. Mr. Tommimas's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analysis of its operation shows, however, that the open-door and lease principles are contradictory, and that the former, if maintained, must inevitably drive the Europeans from their holdings and pretentions in China. Its prestige, originally derived from its psychological effects upon Europe at the time of its proposal, has continued because of its intrinsic value as the embodiment of fair play. When this is clearly perceived it will be impossible to continue those great preserves which four big powers staked out for their own development before Japan got into the game. That Japan's interests lead her to work for this end in company with America is a conclusion that may be commended to those fearful souls who suspect her of being the avowed enemy of every purpose which America has in the East. In his second essay, which took a Columbia University prize last year, the author summarizes the significant steps in our diplomatic intercourse with eastern Asia since the end of the last century. His résumé is decidedly superior to most academic monographs of the sort and is worth a place among textbooks on recent international relations. A feature calling for comment is his use of Japanese sources, particularly those expressing Japanese views and opinions. We have too little in our own language of this kind of comment on current issues. It is illuminating, for example, to learn that a Japanese writer in 1908 called the Root-Takahira agreement a triumph for the United States because "she secures by this Agreement such a position in China, *where she has no substantial standing*," as the German Emperor gained in the Morocco question. The author does not share the opinion of the critic in this instance, but the attitude of the Japanese chauvinist is worth noting. In this and in the Lansing-Ishii agreement Mr. Tommimas considers the United States amply justified in adding the definite political doctrine that China's territorial integrity must be preserved to the economic doctrine of the open-door. His sympathy with the intentions of American diplomatic action is noteworthy; more so is his decided conviction that this harmonizes with the proper objectives of his native country.

IT is hard to find a book that discusses the momentous problems of the Far East in a spicy, informing, and readable manner, and yet is accurate and impartial. Such a book is Frederic Coleman's "The Far East Unveiled" (Houghton Mifflin). Mr. Coleman, a well-known American newspaper correspondent, visited the Far East in 1916 as representative of *The Herald* of Melbourne. If he had gone in 1917 or 1918 he might have found it harder to be fair, calm, and safe. He answers, or calls on others to answer, many important questions: Is Japan keeping the door open in China, especially in Manchuria, or is she keeping it open for herself and closed to others? Is the policy of the Japanese Government dictated by the militarists? Is Japan seeking to possess China, or does she merely want fair scope for expansion? Is Japanese rule in Korea for the good of the Koreans or is it oppressive? Will Japan be able to meet the new industrial problems raised by the demand for factory life and cheap labor? Will there be war between Japan and the United States? In answer to the last question, he is confident that Japan will be unwilling to pursue any policy of aggression which may seem to smack of Prussianism, and that the United States is already, and will remain, too strong to be safely attacked. Mr. Coleman gives us in interviews the opinions, most valuable, of such men as Dr. Wu Ting-fang, President Li Yuan-hung, Liang Chi Chiao, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, General Tuan Chi-jui, Viscount Ishii (whom he speaks of as "conscientious"), Baron Hayashi, Dr. Kunisawa, Mr. Ozaki, Count Terauchi, and Baron Kato. If Americans and Englishmen speak, their names are not recorded.

TWO volumes of English versions of Chinese poetry provide decidedly attractive means of making the acquaintance of a literature in which the Western mind seems destined to become increasingly interested. The larger collection, Mr. Arthur Waley's "A Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems" (Knopf), provides translations of poems for the most part not previously rendered into English, and forms a useful supplement to the well-known work by Mr. H. A. Giles. Unlike Mr. Giles, Mr. Waley avoids the effort to maintain either Chinese or English forms of metre, but, for the sake of greater literalness, writes in free unrhymed verse of varying excellence. He is at his best in rendering the reflective and satiric, rather than the more lyrical, originals; and by far the largest and most valuable portion of his work is that devoted to the somewhat prosaic but intensely interesting personality of the poet Po Chu-i, from whom only a single selection was translated by Giles. A useful introduction and bibliography precede the translations, and the publisher has done good service in clothing them with noticeable good taste. The other collection, "Chinese Lyrics from the Book of Jade" (Huebsch), is made up of translations by James Whitall from the French of Judith Gautier's "Le Livre de Jade." A collection of lyrics which has passed through two processes of translation does not awaken great expectations, but Mr. Whitall's are surprisingly attractive, whatever the degree of accuracy with which they represent the original. Only some thirty poems are included, chosen for their ready appeal through beauty of imagery or feeling; and the translator's phrasing is delicately adapted to his rather fragile material. The special qualities which characterize these lyrics are easy to perceive but difficult to describe. As an increasing amount of material becomes available, it is to be hoped that translation will be followed by analytic criticism which may serve incidentally to throw light on certain tendencies of our current poetry to approximate to the Oriental method.

ANOTHER interesting version from the Orient presents selections, in 121 quatrains, from "The Luzumiyat of Abu 'l-ala" (James T. White), made by Ameen Rihani. Naturally enough, the translator has followed the manner and stanza of Fitzgerald, and presumably has thrown some little emphasis on the passages which exhibit the notable kinship between the meditations of Omar Khayyam and the earlier Arabian skeptic. An introduction gives a useful account of Abu 'l-ala, whom Mr. Rihani calls "the Lucretius of Islam, the Voltaire of the East." The versions he admits not to be literal; for the most part they follow pretty successfully, though at a distance, Fitzgerald's fascinating blend of lyric fluency with epigrammatic point. The eighteenth quatrain will exhibit this, and at the same time represent one of the outstanding resemblances to the Rubaiyat:

The Hand of the Potter
By THEODORE DREISER

The Nation of September 6th says of this powerful four-act play: "In this play there is such characterization and such a projection of the interplay of character through dialogue as we shall seek in vain in any other American play."

One Hundred Copies, *only*, have been autographed by THEODORE DREISER. Readers of *The Nation* who promptly remit $5.00 to the publishers, will receive one of these autographed copies. If these special copies are all sold the book will be sent at the regular price, $1.50 plus 10c. for postage, and the balance remitted.

109 W. 40th St.
BONI & LIVERIGHT, NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tread lightly, for the mighty that have been
Might now be breathing in the dust unseen;
Lightly—the violets beneath thy feet
Spring from the mole of some Arabian queen.

The format of this little volume is most attractive, but it deserved better proof-reading; and both introduction and text need some correction on behalf of English idiom.

"LEO TOLSTOI," by Aylmer Maude (Dodd, Mead), is for the most part an abridgment of the larger "Life of Tolstoi," published by the same author in 1910. Mr. Maude now gives an account of Tolstoi's last days, and adds some minor touches, but makes little use of new sources. The book naturally is of the same sort as the earlier work. The author has no wide intellectual horizon and little acquaintance with philosophy or with æsthetic criticism; he cannot interpret Tolstoi's artistic genius or offer any ordered conception of the development of his religious and ethical system or of his relation to other thinkers. On the other hand, he gives a narrative of the outward events of Tolstoi's life, an account of Tolstoi's teaching, largely through copious extracts from his works, and excellent criticism of that teaching from the point of view of ordinary commonsense. Here he rightly emphasizes Tolstoi's influence, by his destructive criticism of government and of contemporary social conditions, on the development of revolutionary ideas in Russia. Mr. Maude's book is above all valuable as a first-hand description of Tolstoi in his later years and of his relations with his family, friends, and disciples, and as a truly impressive tribute to the power of his personality.

Books of the Week

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Corelli, Marie. My "Little Bit." Doran. $1.75.
Gundelfinger, George F. Ten Years at Yale. Shakespeare Press.
Martens, Frederick H. Violin Mastery. Stokes. $2.50.
Wharton, Edith. French Ways and Their Meaning. Appleton. $1.50.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Bishop, Joseph B. (editor). Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to his Children. Scribners. $2.
Dawson, William H. The Evolution of Modern Germany. Scribners. $5.
Ley, J. W. T. The Dickens Circle. Dutton. $9.
Seibel, George. The Mormon Saints. Pittsburgh: Lessing Co.
Turner, Edward R. Ireland and England. Century. $3.

SCIENCE

Hunter, Walter S. General Psychology. University of Chicago Press. $2.
March, Norah H. Towards Racial Health. Dutton. $2.

POETRY AND DRAMA

"Altair." Chaos. New York: Douglas C. McMurtrie.
Barnhart, Harry, and Mackaye, Percy. The Will of Song. Boni & Liveright. 70 cents.
Dreiser, Theodore. The Hand of the Potter. Boni & Liveright. $1.50.
Dunn, Theodore D. (editor). The Bengali Book of English Verse. Longmans, Green. $3.
Gundelfinger, George F. The Ice Lens. Sewickley, Pennsylvania: The New Fraternity.
Heine, Frank R. The Jumble Book of Rhymes. Asheville, N. C.: Hackney & Moale. $1.
Henley, W. E. Poems. Scribners. $2.50.
Mygatt, Tracy D. Good Friday. The Author. 50 cents.
Roberts, Walter A. Pierrot Wounded, and Other Poems. Britton. $1.25.
Theis, Grover. Numbers and Other One Act Plays. N. L. Brown. $1.35.

FICTION

Ames, Joseph B. Curley of the Circle Bar. Century. $1.50.
Anonymous: The Story of a Lover. Boni & Liveright. $1.50.
Bruno, Guido (editor). Judas Iscariot, and Other Stories. The Editor.
Cunningham, Albert B. Singing Mountains. Doran. $1.50.
Duhamel, Georges. The Heart's Domain. Century. $1.50.
Gilchrist, Beth B. The Camerons of Highboro. Century. $1.35.
Gundelfinger, George F. The New Fraternity. Sewickley, Pennsylvania: The New Fraternity.
MacDonald, Francis C. Sorcery. Century. $1.35.
MacManus, Seumas. Lo, and Behold Ye! Stokes. $1.60.
Oemler, Marie C. A Woman Named Smith. Century. $1.60.
Pertwee, Roland. The Old Card. Boni & Liveright. $1.60.
Sedgwick, Anne D. A Childhood in Brittany Eighty Years Ago. Century. $2.50.
Van Slyke, Lucille. Little Miss By-the-Day. Stokes. $1.50.
Watts, Mary S. From Father to Son. Macmillan. $1.75.
Woden, George. Little Houses. Dutton. $1.90.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Bolshevik Aims and Ideals. Reprinted from the Round Table. Macmillan. $1.
Duggan, Stephen P. (editor). The League of Nations. The Principle and the Practice. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press.
Powell, Thomas R. Indirect Encroachment on Federal Authority by the Taxing Powers of the States. National Tax Association.
Tuttle, Florence G. Women and World Federation. McBride & Co. $1.60.
Wood, Edith E. The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner Macmillan. $2.25.

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

By the author of "A Chaste Man," "The Buffoon," etc.

BRUTE GODS

By LOUIS WILKINSON

¶"A riant and acute psychologist, a writer of singular distinction" (says Lawrence Gilman) "a new and extraordinary talent. Indisputably it is 'not meat for little people or for fools.' But such as deem themselves outside those categories may safely turn to it for consolation in a world of sentimentalists, puritans, and bipedal sheep."

$2.00 at all book shops

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 West 42d Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS
and PERIODICALS
IN ALL LANGUAGES
for CHEMISTS
ENGINEERS
SCIENTISTS
imported
from ENGLAND-FRANCE
GERMANY and all
parts of the world
Let us have your list
of wants now. Quickest
Delivery possible-
FOREIGN DEPARTMENT
Lemcke & Buechner
IMPORTERS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS
32 EAST 20TH ST. NEW YORK
ESTABLISHED 1848

RED FRIDAY
By GEORGE KIBBE TURNER

RED FRIDAY is an ingenious and graphic forecast of the perils that await the invested capital of the United States should Bolshevism obtain the upper hand.

It is the story of a colossal conspiracy between a Bolshevik master mind from Russia named Plangoner, and Stephen Black, a New York secret speculator of great wealth, to overthrow capitalism by destroying the monetary value of American stocks and bonds and place the Bolsheviki in possession of the United States.

Rarely does an imaginative writer deal so effectively with a problem of the hour. Mr. Turner sets forth the perils of Bolshevism in a most startling fashion.

$1.40 *Net. At all Booksellers*

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, Boston

The Happiness of Nations

by James MacKaye

For a hundred and fifty years the cult of commercialism has had for its bible Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. But since the close of the war the world, and particularly the world of labor, has become restless under the dominion of a philosophy which seeks an end so material, and demands that wealth be devoted to the service of life—not life to the service of wealth.

What philosophy is to succeed that of commercialism? No one knows; but present tendencies indicate that it will be a philosophy, not of making a living—but of living. *The Happiness of Nations* is an initial step in such a philosophy. It sustains a revolutionary contention; that science can be applied as directly and successfully to the production of happiness as to the production of wealth—that happiness, as an object of human effort can, in fact, be converted from a predicate for platitudes to an article of manufacture as definite as bricks, or pig iron, or cloth, or flour. This profound book may be had of your bookseller for $1.25 or of B. W. HUEBSCH, *Publisher*, 32 West 58th street, New York, for $1.35, postpaid. If you regret the purchase and return the book in perfect condition in ten days you may have your money back.

The Children's School

For boys and girls from 2 to 10 years

The Children's School attempts to create an all-day all-round life for the city child, through modern educational methods based on fundamental sources of thought and action. It strives to relate the necessary studies directly to the life of the normal child, so that reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and geography do not seem tasks superimposed on him, but appeal to him as natural and interesting accompaniments of his unfolding world.

The school plan embraces all-day activities, hot lunches, afternoon trips. There is a large double-roof playground, carpentry shops, an auditorium for music and dancing. Curriculum includes outdoor nature study, modeling and drawing, spoken French, science. The children are developed in small groups to assure a maximum of personal attention. The activities of the younger groups are carried on largely out of doors.

The teaching staff consists of carefully selected specialists in their several fields. It includes Dr. Hendrik Willem Van Loon, the historian, formerly Lecturer in History at Cornell University, and M. Ernest Bloch, the noted Swiss composer.

Write for booklet.

Margaret Naumburg
Director
32-34 West 68th Street
New York City

THE VENTURER:
A Journal of Freedom and Fellowship

Price Sixpence Monthly
Yearly Subscription to American readers: 7/- (post free).

No. 1 (New Series), ready October 1st,
Will contain contributions by the following:—

C. DELISLE BURNS
H. WILSON HARRIS
LAURENCE HOUSMAN
HAROLD MASSINGHAM
HERMON OULD
S. K. RATCLIFFE
RICHARD ROBERTS
MALCOLM SPARKES
GILBERT THOMAS
ARTHUR WAUGH
M. P. WILLCOCKS

Send for Prospectus

LONDON:
HEADLEY BROS., *Publishers*, Ltd.

NOTICE.—On and after September 1st, 1919, the publishing house hitherto trading under the name of Headley Bros., Publishers, Ltd., will be known as

THE SWARTHMORE PRESS, Ltd.
72, Oxford Street, London, W. 1.

ROUSSEAU AND ROMANTICISM
By Irving Babbitt

A profoundly illuminating commentary on current modes of thought. $3.50 net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston

GENERAL TYPES of SUPERIOR MEN
By
OSIAS L. SCHWARZ

If the numerous friends and admirers of this work would send in advance subscriptions they would make possible the publication of the author's *magnum opus:*

UNCONVENTIONAL
ETHICS
Or
THE ETHICS OF TO-MORROW

A pioneer work destined to revolutionize the current conceptions, and to infuse life into the study, of ethics as well as the other social sciences.

The subscriptions may be sent directly ($3.00 a copy) to the author: 130 W. 83rd Street, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA, OHIO

The Nation

International Relations Section

VOL. CIX TWO SECTIONS—SECTION II—SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1919 No. 2829

Contents

THE SHANTUNG QUESTION AND SPHERES OF INFLUENCE. By Alpheus Henry Snow..... 360

THE TEXT OF THE SHANTUNG TREATY..... 365

THE SHANTUNG AWARD TO JAPAN. By Thomas F. Millard 368

EXTRACTS FROM A CORRESPONDENCE..... 370

COPYRIGHT, 1919, BY THE NATION PRESS, INC., 20 VESEY STREET, NEW YORK CITY

The Shantung Question and Spheres of Influence

By ALPHEUS HENRY SNOW

THE Shantung Question arises out of the following provision of the Peace Treaty:

Germany renounces, in favor of Japan, all her rights, title and privileges—particularly those concerning the territory of Kiaochow, railways, mines, and submarine cables—which she acquired in virtue of the treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shantung.

The "rights, title and privileges" in question are exclusively those which Germany had, on China's domestic territory and within the sphere of its sovereignty, by "treaty" with China and by "arrangements" with the other states having influence in China.

The treaty of March 6, 1898, between China and Germany, as published at Shanghai in 1908 by the Chinese (British-controlled) Imperial Customs Office, was composed of a preamble, three parts, and ratification clauses and signatures. The first part is headed "Lease of Kiaochow," the second, "Railroad and Mining Concessions," and the third, "Priority-Rights in the Province of Shantung."

In the first sentence of the preamble it was stated that the incident at the mission station in the prefecture Tsaochoufu in Shantung had been settled at the time the treaty was made. This incident was the murder of two German Roman Catholic missionaries, about four months previously, at the town which was the birthplace of Confucius, by Chinese political rioters who were members of anti-foreigner societies. Germany sent ships to Kiaochow Bay and landed marines, holding the bay as security for reparation.

The facts concerning the incident and its settlement are given in the correspondence between Sir Claude MacDonald, the British Minister to China, and Lord Salisbury, published in the Parliamentary Papers. The murder of the German priests, as a political anti-Christian and anti-foreigner act, and the complicity of the Governor of Shantung, were conclusively proved by the testimony of a third German priest who was attacked with the two others and who escaped. The naval action of Germany relieved Great Britain from carrying out a threat to send a punitive expedition into Shantung, as is shown by the following extract from a letter of Sir Claude MacDonald to Lord Salisbury, of December 1, 1897:

During the summer there were prevalent in this province rumors of the kidnapping of children of foreigners, which produced much excitement, and placed the missionaries in the interior in great danger. The Governor, in spite of much pressure, did nothing to suppress these rumors, and even by his attitude gave them tacit encouragement. After repeatedly calling the Yamên's attention to his conduct, I was at last obliged to desire them to warn him that if any serious incident occurred as a result of his anti-foreign spirit, he would find himself in jeopardy. This I did in a note so long ago as the 27th of July, and the result was, according to a report from His Majesty's council at Chefoo, that active measures were at length taken to check the rumors and the ferment thereupon subsided.

It is not possible at present to ascertain whether this agitation has indirectly led to the present outrage, but the Governor's attitude has been such as to induce full approval of the German demand for his dismissal.

That the sending of the three small German cruisers from Shanghai, where they had been lying, to Kiaochow Bay, had the acquiescence, if not the approval, of Great Britain, which, then as now, controlled the coasts of China from Hong-Kong, is shown by the following extract from the same letter:

If the German occupation of Kiaochow is only used as a leverage for obtaining satisfactory reparation, . . . for the murder of German missionaries, the effect on the security of our own people will be of the best.

If, on the other hand, the German object is to secure Kiaochow as a naval station under cover of their demands for reparation, it is by no means clear that their acquisition of it will prejudice our interests.

The terms of the reparation settlement were agreed upon about two months before the treaty was signed. The Governor was degraded. The money reparation included compensation to the relatives of the murdered priests, damages for injury to the mission buildings, and a contribution to the building of mission chapels near the scene of the murder. The reparation-money was paid to the Roman Catholic authorities.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRENTANO'S

BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD

5th Avenue and 27th Street
NEW YORK CITY
Established 1853

PARIS
37 Avenue de l'Opera
Established 1887

WASHINGTON, D. C.
F. and 12th Streets
Established 1884

Central European Purchasing Office, 5 rue Coetlogon, Paris
Corresponding Agents in London, Milan, Madrid, Copenhagen, Amsterdam
Petrograd, Tokio, Buenos Aires.

Theodore Roosevelt

An Intimate Biography

By WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER

Illustrated, 8vo. $5.00 net

THE name Theodore Roosevelt is never heard with indifference. Living, he held the world's attention; and his life story cannot fail to thrill. Give such material to a pen uniquely practised in portraiture, in the hand of Roosevelt's ardent supporter and life-long friend, William Roscoe Thayer, and the biography of the decade, faithful and felicitous, springs into being.

Mr. Thayer needs no introducing: his monumental and brilliantly successful studies of Cavour and John Hay were crowned by the American Academy of Arts and Letters, and by European critics, giving him an enviable position among American biographers. Both works perfected his extraordinary gift for sympathetic portrayal of personality, and the researches required in preparing The Life of John Hay, gave Mr. Thayer minute knowledge of political conditions later reacting on Roosevelt's presidency.

We commend Thayer's Theodore Roosevelt to your attention. No book of the year will be more read and discussed. Your advance order will enable us to send you the book on date of publication, October 1.

BRENTANO'S
Retail Department
Fifth Avenue and 27th Street
New York

BRENTANO'S:
Kindly send on publication THAYER'S THEODORE ROOSEVELT, $5.00 (postage extra).

Name.....

Address.....

Other Books by William Roscoe Thayer

Life of Cavour	*(New Edition Preparing)*	2 vols.	
Life and Letters of John Hay		2 vols.	**$7.50**
Dawn of Italian Independence		2 vols.	**$7.00**
Italica			**$2.25**
A Short History of Venice			**$2.50**

Forwarding Charges Extra

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany obtained, for itself and all foreign states, an Imperial tablet condemnatory of the anti-Christian and anti-foreigner proceedings. The next year the Vatican granted to Germany the ecclesiastical protectorate over Roman Catholics in Shangtung; this religious sphere of influence being subtracted from that of France, which had theretofore extended over all China.

The treaty stated that the Chinese Government regarded the occasion of the amicable closing of the reparation settlement as an appropriate one for giving a concrete evidence of its grateful recognition of friendship shown to it by Germany. Though repayment of the social obligation is thus put forward as the main inducement on the part of China in making the treaty, it is also stated, as further inducement, that China is desirous of "increasing the military preparedness of the Empire." The inducement on Germany's part is declared to be its desire to have, "like other powers, a place on the Chinese coast, under its own jurisdiction"—which desire China declares to be "justifiable." The inducement on the part of both Germany and China is declared to be a "mutual and reciprocal desire further to develop the economic and commercial relations between the citizens of the two states."

The treaty granted an extraterritorial port privilege within the area including Kiaochow Bay and its environs—a land-and-water area about fifteen miles square—together with an extraterritorial foreign-settlement privilege on the shore of Kiaochow Bay. This area was leased to Germany for ninety-nine years "for the repair and equipment of ships, for the storage of materials and provisions for the same, and for other arrangements connected therewith." It was provided that Germany should "construct, at a suitable time, on the leased territory, fortifications for the protection of the buildings and the defense of the entrance to the harbor."

The German words concerning the leasehold grant were *überlässt pachtweise vorläufig auf 99 Jahre.* A literal translation of this phrase is "grants according to the analogy of leases [in German law], as a provisional or interlocutory measure *(vorläufig)* for ninety-nine years." It seems probable that by the use of the word *vorläufig*, it was intended by the parties to make the lease subject to the terms of the international *entente* concerning spheres of influence in China, not only as that *entente* then existed but also as it should be varied in the future by mutual agreement of China and the powers.

It was also provided that "in order to avoid the possibility of conflicts, the Imperial Chinese Government will abstain from exercising rights of sovereignty in the ceded territory during the term of the lease." China had thus the paramount sovereignty over the leased territory, and Germany a sovereignty subordinate to that of China and limited by the terms of the lease. China reserved to its citizens and shipping within the leased area the same rights as the citizens and shipping of other states.

Inasmuch as Germany's leasehold territory was a part of the coast border of China, it was agreed that Germany should take no action within that territory which would interfere with the unity of the Chinese tariff. Germany had thus the option to make a designated port of its leased territory a free port—which she did—or to collect there the Chinese tariff and pay it to China.

In order that the relationship between Germany and China might be continued in case Germany should see fit to resign its leasehold privileges, it was provided that "should Germany at some future time express the wish to restore Kiaochow Bay to China before the expiration of the lease, China agrees to refund to Germany the expenditure she has incurred at Kiaochow, and to cede to Germany a more suitable port."

As incidental to the necessity of obtaining an adequate water-supply for the leased territory and enabling it to be defended without violating China's sovereignty, a zone of land thirty miles wide adjoining the leased territory was by the treaty placed under a kind of partnership sovereignty *(vereinbart)*. Within this zone, China expressly retained full sovereignty, but agreed "to abstain from taking any measures, or issuing any ordinances therein, without the previous consent of the German Government, and especially to place no obstacle in the way of any regulation of the water-courses which may prove to be necessary."

The second part of the treaty, headed "Railroad and Mining Concessions," was concerned solely with two specifically described railroad-and-mining concessions in Shantung. These were by the treaty definitely allotted to German-Chinese corporations to be formed for the purpose, in which the German and Chinese stockholders were to have equal rights and proportional representation in the directorate. Provisions were made to assure the protection of the German personnel of the working staff; and it was required that the work should be done, and the concessions operated, in conf rmity with the general regulations of China. The two railroads formed a branch to connect Kiaochow Bay with the proposed trunk line from Peking to Canton. This trunk line, when extended southward to the British railroad system in Burma and the French system in Indo-China, was to form a part of the southern Peking-to-Paris line which was to compete with the Peking-to-Paris line via the Manchurian and the Russian Trans-Siberian Railways. As respects the section of this trunk line in Shantung, the treaty gave no special concession to German or German-Chinese corporations. The mining privileges within a zone of twelve miles wide on either side of the German-Chinese branch line specified in the concession were also granted. These concessions were to be operated by German-Chinese corporations on the same terms as the railroad concession.

The third part of the treaty, headed "Priority Rights in the Province of Shantung," related to all future internal development concessions in Shantung which China might see fit to open to foreign bidding. It has been claimed that the effect of Part III was to give Germany a right of sovereignty throughout the Province of Shantung. The words of the treaty disprove this claim and show that Germany had only an economic privilege in behalf of its engineers and merchants. The German text and the translation of this part of the treaty are as follows:

III—Theil.—Prioritätsrechte in der Provinz Shantung.

Die Kaiserlich Chinesische Regierung verpflichtet sich in allen Fällen, wo zu irgendwelchen Zwecken innerhalb der Provinz Shantung fremdländische Hülfe an Personen, an Kapital oder Material in Anspruch genommen werden soll, die betreffenden Arbeiten oder die Lieferung von

Part III—Priority Rights in the Province of Shantung.

The Chinese Imperial Government obligates itself, in all cases in which foreign aid for any purpose, within the Province of Shantung, shall be solicited, in the form of personal services, the furnishing of capital, or the supply of materials, to present the proposals and speci-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zunächst deutschen Industriellen und Handeltreibenden, welche sich mit dergleichen Sachen befassen, anzubieten.

Falls die deutschen Industriellen und Handeltreibenden nicht geneigt sind, die Ausführung solcher Arbeiten oder die Lieferung von Materialien zu übernehmen, so soll China nach Belieben anders verfahren können.

fications for the public works or material-supply under consideration, in the first instance to German industrial-development-engineers and material-supply-merchants who are engaged in similar undertakings, for a bid by them.

In case the German industrial-development-engineers and material-supply-merchants are not disposed to undertake the public works or the supply of materials under consideration, China shall be free to proceed in any manner which it may deem expedient.

Under this article, the Chinese Government was obligated to offer first to competent German contractors its specifications for any public improvements which it thought proper to make in Shantung, and for which it desired foreign aid. It was free to reject any bid so obtained, and the German contractors could not, by refusing to bid, interfere with China's freedom of action. Only in case the German contractors made a bid which the Chinese Government considered advantageous, and which was in fact better than was likely to be obtained elsewhere, could they hope for the contract. The fact that the railroad coast-terminal was under German jurisdiction and that the railroads from the coast to the interior, and the mines adjacent, were owned and operated by German-Chinese corporations, would protect the German contractors, and might enable them in most cases to make a better bid than their competitors. They and their competitors were assured by the "Hay Proposals," which were accepted by Germany and the other powers, against discrimination either through railroad rates, customs duties, or harbor dues.

Considering the risk incident to railroad and mining enterprises, and public contracts of all kinds, in the unsettled condition of China, the economic concessions granted by the treaty seem not to have been unreasonable. Nor, it would seem, were the political privileges at the coast-terminal, or the military and water-supply privileges in the adjoining defensive zone, greater than were reasonably necessary to make the economic privileges effective. Certainly, these specific and carefully defined privileges compare favorably with the indefinite privileges claimed by the other powers having spheres of influence in China under their various treaties and concessions.

There appears to have been no abuse by Germany of the social, political, and economic privileges granted to her. That such privileges are capable of gross abuse in the hands of a power disposed to use them for political purposes goes without saying.

The proposals which Germany made to China in December, 1898, for railroad, terminal-port and priority-bid-right concessions in Shantung were understood by China and all the treaty powers to have for their object the obtaining by Germany of a sphere of influence similar to those of other powers.

Since 1841, when Great Britain, at the close of the Opium War, obtained a cession of Hong-Kong in perpetuity, Great Britain had claimed and exercised the paramount sphere of influence over all China proper. France, asserting a "special interest" in South China, by reason of the "propinquity" of its conquests and colonies at the southern extremity of China—Tonkin, Annam, and Cochin-China—claimed a sphere of influence in South China up to the Yang-tse Valley. Russia, under the secret—though unofficially published—"Cassini Convention" of 1896, was claiming a sphere of influence throughout Manchuria.

Japan, ejected from Manchuria in 1895, after having exacted it from China in the Chinese-Japanese War, had Korea and Formosa, and was in military occupation of Wei-hai-wei in North Shantung, holding it as security for payment of the indemnity exacted.

Of the outer states of the Chinese Empire, Burma was a colony of Great Britain, and Thibet and Western Mongolia were under its sole influence. A Russian sphere of influence was extended over Eastern Mongolia.

In order that Germany might acquire a sphere of influence, it was necessary that she should obtain from China the minimum privileges necessary to create such a sphere, and that the treaty of concession should be confirmed by "arrangements" with Great Britain, France, and Russia. Russia, in its effort to secure the approval of Great Britain and France to its still doubtful claim to a sphere of influence in Manchuria, was in the same position as Germany. Moreover, under the Cassini Convention, Russia was granted a fifteen-year lease of Kiaochow Bay, and only economic terminal rights, under China's full sovereignty, at Port Arthur and Talienwan. She was therefore willing to relinquish her political rights in Kiaochow Bay in case she could obtain political rights at the terminals of her Manchurian railroad necessary for the protection of the railroad enterprise. Thus Germany and Russia, together, were able to bring about a discussion of the whole question of the propriety of spheres of influence in China, their relation to the traditional policy of the powers, and the rearrangements necessitated by the advent of the two powers.

There was no doubt concerning the traditional policy of the powers with respect to China. By all the treaties, it was expressed or implied that the sovereignty of China was recognized and was to be respected; that the integrity of its territorial domain was to be preserved; and that the nationals of all foreign nations in China were to be assured equal commercial opportunity without any discrimination. To this general policy, which the Occidental States profess (though rarely practice) towards all transitional states, the popular name of "the open door" is applied. The Conference of Algeciras of 1906 regarding Morocco, gave it a better name—"the triple principle"—which, however, has not yet come into popular use.

In 1898, the question of the relation of spheres of influence to the open-door policy was raised by collisions of interests of the sphere-of-influence powers in various parts of the world; particularly in Africa by the Fashoda incident, and in China by the claims of Russia and Germany. The subject became a matter of public discussion. The liberals in Europe and the United States asserted that spheres of influence were mere veiled processes of partition, military conquest and annexation, and unjustifiable; the conservatives, that they were necessary to the economic development of the world, and legitimate.

Between December, 1897, and March, 1898, negotiations occurred between the Governments of the leading nations,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTIOCH COLLEGE

and an *entente* on the subject was reached. The *entente* determined particularly the relations of the Occidental States and Japan to China, and that of the European States to Middle and Northeastern Africa, and established the necessary arrangements. The principles agreed upon in this *entente*, as to China, were announced by Mr. Balfour, then Leader of the House, in an address to his constituents in East Manchester on January 10, 1898; and as to Africa, in a speech in the British House of Commons by Mr. Chamberlain, Secretary for the Colonies, on February 24—Sir Edward Grey, the Opposition leader, concurring. The treaty between China and Germany was signed on March 6, 1898.

Mr. Balfour stated the *entente* concerning China in terms of "British policy." This policy, he said, was primarily to maintain the open door in China. Great Britain, he said, did not regard it as contrary to this primary principle that other states should have in China extraterritorial port-privileges and accompanying foreign-settlement privileges, provided these ports were kept open on equal terms to the commerce of all nations, and provided the unity and uniformity of the customs system of China was not interfered with. Great Britain, he also said, did not regard it as contrary to this primary principle that other nations than Great Britain should have economic rights on behalf of their nationals in the foreign trade of China or in aiding China with respect to its internal development, provided these rights were not exclusive. This statement, which was shown by Mr. Chamberlain's statement of February 24 concerning Africa to have been accepted by France as a part of the general *entente*, amounted to an approval of the pending proposal of Russia for a sphere of influence in Manchuria, and of Germany for a sphere of influence in Shantung, since these proposals conformed to the rules established by the *entente* concerning China. The needful grants and ratifying acquiescences were exchanged during the year 1898. The final details of the *entente* as respects China were arranged on the initiative of the United States, through the "Hay Proposals" of July, 1899, addressed to and accepted by the powers having or claiming to have spheres of influence in China. It was by the "Hay Proposals," apparently, that the term "sphere of influence" first received international recognition as a term describing a legitimate international institution.

Russia relinquished the leasehold of Kiaochow Bay in consideration of obtaining the undisputed sphere of influence for railroad and mining development in Manchuria, terminal-port and extraterritorial foreign-settlement privil ges at Talienwan (later Dalny) under a twenty-five year lease, and fortress rights for the same period at the natural Manchurian fortress of Port Arthur. In addition to the enormous colonies and concessions previously mentioned, France and Great Britain seized the opportunity further to increase their influence and territory. France acquiesced in the various arrangements, in consideration of obtaining terminal-port and extraterritorial foreign-settlement privilege by ninety-nine year lease at Kwang-chau-wan, in the southern extremity of China, and a sphere of influence for railroad and mining development in the southern part of China to the limits of the valley of the Yang-tse River; China's hesitant action being quickened by military pressure brought to bear by France on account of the murder of two French naval officers near Kwang-chau-wan. Great Britain obtained various compensations—first, the fortress and naval base of Wei-hai-wei in North Shantung, commanding the German concession at Kiaochow, Port Arthur, the Gulf of Pechili, Peking, and all North China. This port was then held by Japan as security for payment of the indemnity exacted by it from China by the terms of the treaty of peace at the close of the Chinese-Japanese War. A German and a British banking syndicate provided China with the necessary loan to pay the indemnity, in equal shares. Great Britain further obtained from China the concession, by ninety-nine year lease, of the Kowloon district on the mainland of China opposite to the British island fortress and naval and commercial harbor of Hong-Kong, thus securing the encircling territory of Hong-Kong Bay and being enabled to complete its fortification. She also obtained the assurance of all concerned that her sphere of influence throughout the Yang-tse Valley—the great and enormously productive middle zone of China, including the international port and city of Shanghai—should remain undisputed. The area of North China, north of Shantung, including Peking and the international port and city of Tientsin, was recognized as an international political sphere of influence, though still economically a British sphere. Italy demanded a port and a sphere of influence, but was denied the privilege. With the consent of China, it was agreed that a British banking syndicate should finance and build the south half of the Shantung section of the South Peking-to-Paris trunk line then projected to pass through Nanking and Canton, and that a German banking syndicate should build the north half of the section.

The indemnity to Japan furnished by England and Germany having been paid, Japan evacuated Wei-hai-wei, and being thus forced out of China was compelled to content herself temporarily with Korea and the island of Formosa, which she had obtained from China by conquest in the Chinese-Japanese War. The government officials of China viewed with relief the action of Germany and Russia in obtaining their ports and spheres of influence, as strengthening the defenses of China by placing two more Occidental powers on the coast facing Japan. The common people, however, regarded the institution of the spheres of influence with suspicion. They had been deeply angered at the humiliating despoilment insisted upon by Japan at the close of the Chinese-Japanese War, which was permitted by the Occidental powers. They thenceforth regarded Japan as China's permanent enemy and looked upon the Occidental powers as treacherous friends, who, while professing to regard China as an independent state, were, by means of Japan, preparing the way for China's disorganization, partition, and ultimate enslavement. At that time, 1895, the anti-foreign and anti-Christian movement which in 1900 eventuated in the Boxer Revolution and the massacre of the foreigners, and especially Christians, had its beginning. This movement was not assuaged by the action of the powers in 1896, in inducing Japan to give up her conquests in Manchuria; for it soon appeared that, as compensation, China was forced to give her the privilege of having a foreign consular jurisdiction over all citizens of Japan throughout China. Japan was thus put on a parity with the Occidental States, while China was denied a reciprocal privilege in Japan—an intense humiliation, which both Government and people of China properly resented.

The international arrangements of 1898 were in pursuance of a definite, well thought-out plan. The railroad and mining enterprises were to be instruments of defence as well as means for internal development. The one probable aggressor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had in mind by all concerned was Japan; and the probable place of invasion was Kiaochow Bay, since this from a military standpoint is best adapted for sudden invasion. Great Britain, intrenched at its fortresses of Wei-hai-wei and Hong-Kong, and still claiming a paramount sphere of influence over China for all purposes, supervised Germany's operations in Shantung and Russia's operations in Manchuria. All the Occidental States concerned were so located on the coast of China that, united, they could render such prompt aid as to make a Japanese invasion impossible. Disunion of these states in 1905 permitted Japan to seize Port Arthur and Dalny. The defences of China against Japan are seriously weakened by the political sphere of influence and the strategic military position which Japan holds in Southern Manchuria.

Germany's privileges, under the treaty, though essentially economic, were also social and of a strictly personal and highly confidential character. The spheres of influence were granted by China to Germany and to the other states as personal and social privileges, in order that both might receive benefit. All social privileges are based on friendship and a desire to help one's friends and one's self, and are by their nature non-transferable. The relations of close friendship on which such privileges are based do not rise from "propinquity." A neighbor is not necessarily a friend; certainly not always one whom one would choose as a trusted associate in developing one's own property, or to whom one would give the privilege of a continuous lodgment on one's homestead. On the contrary, a neighbor who is untrustworthy is by his neighborhood doubly disqualified from being admitted into such a confidential social relationship, and neighborhood in such case is only disadvantageous. The only "special relations" which any state can properly put forward as entitling it to a sphere of influence within the body-politic of another state, are the "special relations" of friendship, mutual confidence and mutual aid, which grow up between states and persons of good will toward each other; and the only "special interests" are those which each state and each person has in advancing the welfare of all other states and all other persons. These "special relations," and "special interests," are the basis of the Monroe Doctrine.

The leasehold rights of Germany were expressly declared to be non-transferable. The provision in the German text of the treaty is: *"Deutschland verpflichtet sich das von China gepachtete Gebiet niemals an eine andere Macht weiter zu verpachten."* A literal translation of these words is: "Germany obligates itself never to extend farther the leasing process, as respects the territory leased from China, to any other state." This clearly cuts off all privilege of transfer of the territory, whether by assignment or sub-lease.

So long as China was neutral, the concessions to Germany doubtless remained in force. The military operations of Great Britain and Japan, outside the leased territory, and probably also within it, were violations of China's neutrality. By China's co-belligerency with Great Britain and Japan, these violations were doubtless condoned. On the declaration of war by China, Germany's privileges of all kinds in Shantung lapsed, and her state-property in the leased territory reverted to China. The action of the Allied and Associated Powers is, therefore, not a transfer of Germany's sphere of influence to Japan, but the attempted institution by the allied and associated states other than China of a new sphere of influence in favor of Japan in Shantung similar to that which Germany had before the war; and an attempted transfer to Japan of the title of China to the former public property of Germany in Tsingtao. China properly insists upon the right to choose among all the states of the world, without regard to their location, those whom it regards as states of good will, and to select those whom it may properly admit to its honor and confidence and to lodgment within its own domains, in order that they may help it in helping itself during the trying period of its transition from an Oriental to an Occidental economic status. The "twenty-one demands" of Japan, backed by military force, are in law nugatory. The secret treaties of Great Britain and France with Japan, and the action of the President of the United States in signing the Shantung provision of the Peace Treaty, are equally nugatory. It only remains for the Senate of the United States to announce the legal situation, and to insist upon an amendment whereby the Shantung provisions will be stricken out of the treaty.

The theory and practice of the various states differ as respects spheres of influence. According to French and Japanese philosophy, they are essentially political institutions having an economic and also a political object. By the Germans and Russians they are regarded as essentially economic-social institutions, with such political privileges as are needful to render them efficient. In British practice they are one thing or the other according to the views of the British government concerning the policy to be pursued in any particular exigency. The United States, by the "Hay Proposals," recognized spheres of influence as legitimate institutions without attempting to define their import. Whatever the theory or practice, however, they unquestionably menace the peace of the states where they exist and the proper economic development of the world.

Shantung*

By WITTER BYNNER

(*Reprinted from* THE NATION *of May 24*)

IN the west you free Jerusalem,
But in the east you sell
T'ai Shan, the Holy Mountain.
I hear a temple bell
Breathing, like a perfume,
From its exalted place
The presence of Confucius,
The wisdom of a race,
The future of a people,
The only one of all
Whose conquerors are conquered,
Whose history is tall—
Taller than Fujiyama,
Taller than Koyasan,
Taller than that red sun
Consuming from Japan . . .
And my face is in the flowers,
And my brow is in the dust,
And my heart is sick with perfume
And I weep because I must;
I weep for you, O masters,
O conquerors, O slaves,
As I hear you stir in China
The quiet of your graves.

*In Shantung Confucius was born and died, and there still lives his descendant in the seventy-sixth generation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY
WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

The Text of the Shantung Treaty

THE IMPORTANCE *which the Shantung Question has assumed in international affairs makes desirable the publication of this text at this time. There is, furthermore, a special reason why this should be done. The German and Chinese texts of the treaty are accessible only in a few of the largest libraries, and in neither the English nor the American collections of Chinese treaties is there a complete and adequate translation. This defect in these compilations is not due to any fault of the compilers, but to the peculiar circumstances of the case, which are as follows:*

Upon the exchange of ratifications at Berlin on April 29, 1898, the German Government published a portion of the treaty which it termed "the political concessions," and withheld from publication the remainder, which it described as "the commercial concessions." The portion thus published consisted of the preamble, part I, the ratification clauses and the signatures; the portion withheld included parts II and III. The reason for Germany's action in withholding the "commercial concessions," as stated by von Bülow, the Foreign Minister, according to the British Parliamentary Papers, was that "France, England, and Russia had observed secrecy as to concessions made to them."

The British Embassy at Berlin immediately made a translation of the part of the treaty so published and sent it to the Foreign Office. This translation, which was substantially though not exactly accurate, was printed in the Parliamentary Papers. It was followed in the American collection of Chinese treaties compiled by Rockhill in 1905, and in the English collection compiled by Hertslet and Parkes, giving the treaties in force on January 1, 1908.

The official German text of the "commercial concessions" (parts II and III) was not published until after the two compilations mentioned. Rockhill, in his compilation, explained by footnote that his version of these provisions of the treaty was made from unofficial sources. Hertslet and Parkes reproduced a summary of the provisions of parts II and III made from the Chinese text by the British Minister at Peking, which was sent by him to the Foreign Office on May 27, 1898, and published in the Parliamentary Papers.

The German text as here given is taken from a book issued in 1908 by the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs Office, under British control, at Shanghai, entitled "Treaties, Conventions, etc., between China and Foreign States," in which the German and Chinese texts are given in parallel columns, but which gives no English translation. The text of the preamble, part I, the ratification clauses and the signatures, is identical with that which appears in the German official publication, Das Staatsarchiv, Vol. 61, No. 11518.

German Official Text

NACHDEM nunmehr die Vorfälle bei der Mission in der Präfectur Ts'aochoufu in Shantung ihre Erledigung gefunden haben, hält es die Kaiserlich Chinesische Regierung für angezeigt, ihre dankbare Anerkennung für die ihr seither von Deutschland bewiesene Freundschaft noch besonders zu bethätigen. Es haben daher die Kaiserlich Deutsche und die Kaiserlich Chinesische Regierung, durchdrungen von dem gleichmässigen und gegenseitigen Wunsche, die freundschaftlichen Bande beider Länder zu kräftigen und die wirthschaftlichen und Handelsbeziehungen der Unterthanen beider Staaten mit einander weiter zu entwickeln, nachstehende Separat-Convention abgeschlossen:—

I. Theil.—Verpachtung von Kiaotschau.

ARTIKEL I

Seine Majestät der Kaiser von China, von der Absicht geleitet, die freundschaftlichen Beziehungen zwischen China und Deutschland zu kräftigen und zugleich die militärische Bereitschaft des Chinesischen Reiches zu stärken, verspricht, indem Er Sich alle Rechte der Souveränität in einer Zone von 50 Kilometern (100 chinesischen *Li*) im Umkreise von der Kiaotschau Bucht bei Hochwasserstand vorbehält, in dieser Zone den freien Durchmarsch Deutscher Truppen zu jeder Zeit zu gestatten, sowie daselbst keinerlei Massnahmen oder Anordnungen ohne vorhergehende Zustimmung der Deutschen Regierung zu treffen und insbesondere einer etwa erforderlich werdenden Regulirung der Wasserläufe kein Hinderniss entgegenzusetzen. Seine Majestät der Kaiser von China behält Sich hierbei vor, in jener Zone im Einvernehmen mit der Deutschen Regierung Truppen zu stationiren sowie andere militärische Massregeln zu treffen.

English Translation

THE incident at the mission-station in the prefecture of Tsaochoufu in Shantung having now been settled by amicable agreement, the Imperial Chinese Government regards the occasion as a suitable one for giving a special and concrete proof of its grateful recognition of the friendship which has hitherto at all times been manifested by Germany towards China. In consequence, the Imperial German Government and the Imperial Chinese Government, inspired by the mutual and reciprocal desire to strengthen the bonds of friendship between their two countries and farther to develop the economic and trade relations of the citizens of the two states respectively with each other, have concluded the following Special Convention:

Part I—Leasing-Arrangements Concerning Kiaochow

ARTICLE I

His Majesty the Emperor of China, in pursuance of the object of strengthening the friendly relations between China and Germany, and increasing the military preparedness of the Chinese Empire, gives his promise—while he reserves to himself all rights of sovereignty in a zone fifty kilometres (one hundred Chinese *li*) in width surrounding the line of high-water mark of Kiaochow Bay—to permit within this zone the free passage of German troops at all times, and also to make no decree concerning measures of policy or administration affecting this zone without the previous assent of the German Government; and especially not to interpose any hindrance to any regulation of the watercourses which at any time may become necessary. His Majesty the Emperor of China hereby reserves to himself the right, in friendly understanding with the German Government, to station troops in the zone above mentioned, and also to decree other military administrative measures.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARTIKEL II

In der Absicht, den berechtigten Wunsch Seiner Majestät des Deutschen Kaisers zu erfüllen, dass Deutschland gleich anderen Mächten einen Platz an der Chinesischen Küste inne haben möge für die Ausbesserung and Ausrüstung von Schiffen, für die Niederlegung von Materialien und Vorräthen für dieselben, sowie für sonstige dazu gehörende Einrichtungen, überlässt Seine Majestät der Kaiser von China beide Seiten des Eingangs der Bucht von Kiaotschau pachtweise, vorläufig auf 99 Jahre, an Deutschland. Deutschland übernimmt es, in gelegener Zeit auf dem ihm überlassenen Gebiete Befestigungen zum Schutze der gedachten baulichen Anlagen und der Einfahrt des Hafens zur Ausführung zu bringen.

ARTIKEL III

Um einem etwaigen Entstehen von Konflikten vorzubeugen, wird die Kaiserlich Chinesische Regierung während der Pachtdauer im verpachteten Gebiete Hoheitsrechte nicht ausüben, sondern überlässt die Ausübung derselben an Deutschland, und zwar für folgendes Gebiet:

1. An der nördlichen Seite des Eingangs der Bucht: Die Landzunge abgegrenzt nach Nordosten durch eine von der nordöstlichen Ecke von Potato Island nach Loshan-Harbour gezogene Linie,
2. An der südlichen Seite des Eingangs zur Bucht: Die Landzunge abgegrenzt nach Südwesten durch eine von dem südwestlichsten Punkte der südsüdwestlich von Chiposan Island befindlichen Einbuchtung in der Richtung auf Tolosan Island gezogene Linie,
3. Inseln Chiposan und Potato Island,
4. [Für] die gesammte Wasserfläche der Bucht bis zum höchsten derzeitigen Wasserstande,
5. [Für] sämmtliche der Kiaotschau Bucht vorgelagerten und für deren Vertheidigung von der Seeseite in Betracht kommenden Inseln, wie namentlich Tolosan, Tschalientau etc.

Eine genauere Festsetzung der Grenzen des an Deutschland verpachteten Gebiets sowie der 50 Kilometerzone um die Bucht herum behalten sich die hohen Kontrahenten vor, durch beiderseitig zu ernennende Kommissare nach Massgabe der örtlichen Verhältnisse vorzunehmen.

Chinesischen Kriegs- und Handelsschiffen sollen in der Kiaotschau Bucht dieselben Vergünstigungen zu Theil werden wie den Schiffen anderer mit Deutschland befreundeter Nationen, und es soll das Ein- und Auslaufen sowie der Aufenthalt chinesischer Schiffe in der Bucht keinen anderen Einschränkungen unterworfen werden, als die Kaiserlich Deutsche Regierung kraft der an Deutschland auch für die gesammte Wasserfläche der Bucht übertragenen Hoheitsrechte, in Bezug auf die Schiffe anderer Nationen zu irgend einer Zeit festzusetzen für geboten erachten wird.

ARTIKEL IV

Deutschland verpflichtet sich, auf dem Inseln und Untiefen vor Eingang der Bucht die erforderlichen Seezeichen zu errichten.

Von chinesischen Kriegs- und Handelsschiffen sollen in der Kiaotschau Bucht keine Abgaben erhoben werden, ausgenommen solche, denen auch andere Schiffe zum Zwecke der Unterhaltung der nöthigen Hafen- und Quaianlagen unterworfen werden.

ARTIKEL V

Sollte Deutschland später einmal den Wunsch äussern, die Kiaotschau Bucht vor Ablauf der Pachtzeit an China zurückzugeben, so verpflichtet sich China, die Aufwendungen, die Deutschland in Kiaotschau gemacht hat, zu ersetzen und einen besser geeigneten Platz an Deutschland zu gewähren.

Deutschland verpflichtet sich, das von China gepachtete Gebiet niemals an eine andere Macht weiter zu verpachten.

ARTICLE II

With the object of fulfilling the justifiable wish of the German Emperor, that Germany, like other Powers, may have a place on the Chinese coast under its own jurisdiction, for the repair and fitting out of its ships, for the storing of materials and supplies for the same, and also for the establishment of other appliances connected therewith, His Majesty the Emperor of China concedes to Germany, by way of lease, provisionally for ninety-nine years, both sides of the entrance to Kiaochow Bay. Germany undertakes to carry through to completion, upon the territory conceded to it, the fortifications for the protection of the buildings and establishments and for the defence of the entrance of the harbor.

ARTICLE III

In order to prevent any possibility of conflicts arising, the Imperial Chinese Government will not, during the term of the lease, exercise rights of sovereignty, but concedes the exercise of the same to Germany, over the following explicitly defined territory:

1. On the northerly side of the entrance of the bay: The tongue of land bounded on its northeasterly side by a line drawn from the northeasterly corner of Potato Island to Loshan Harbor.
2. On the southerly side of the entrance of the bay: The tongue of land bounded on its southwesterly side by a line drawn from the southwesterly point of the inlet situated southwestward of Chiposan Island in a straight line to Tolosan Island.
3. The Chiposan Islands and Potato Island.
4. The whole expanse of water of the bay up to the highest water-mark as it is at this time.
5. All the islands which front upon Kiaochow Bay, and which require to be taken into consideration for the defence of the bay from the side towards the sea, namely, for example, Tolosan, Tschalientau, etc.

The high contracting parties bind themselves to have planned out and established an exact fixation of the boundaries of this territory leased to Germany and also of the fifty-kilometre zone around the bay: this to be done by commissioners appointed by both parties respectively and in a manner adapted to the local circumstances.

Chinese war-ships and merchant-ships shall participate in all privileges in Kiaochow Bay on the same basis with the other nations which are on friendly terms with Germany, and the entrance and departure, as well as the sojourn of Chinese ships in the bay, shall be subjected to no other limitations than those which the Imperial German Government, by authority of the rights of sovereignty over the whole extent of the bay ancillary to its land-rights and hereby conceded to it, may, at any time, by public decree, declare to be prohibitions applicable to the ships of other nations.

ARTICLE IV

Germany obligates itself to erect the necessary guides and signals for navigation on the islands and shoals in front of the entrance of the bay.

No imposts shall be collected from Chinese war-ships or merchant-ships in Kiaochow Bay except those to which other ships are subjected, for the purpose of the upkeep of the necessary harbor and wharf establishments.

ARTICLE V

In case Germany should hereafter at any time express the wish to give back Kiaochow Bay to China before the expiration of the term of the lease, China obligates itself to make good the expenditures which Germany shall have made in Kiaochow, and to concede to Germany a better place to be under Germany's own jurisdiction.

Germany obligates itself never to give any kind of leasehold right to any other power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Der in dem Pachtgebiet wohnenden chinesischen Bevölkerung soll, vorausgesetzt, dass sie sich den Gesetzen und der Ordnung entsprechend verhält, jederzeit der Schutz der Deutschen Regierung zu Theil werden; sie kann, soweit nicht ihr Land für andere Zwecke in Anspruch genommen wird, dort verbleiben.

Wenn Grundstücke chinesischer Besitzer zu irgend welchen Zwecken in Anspruch genommen werden, so sollen die Besitzer dafür entschädigt werden.

Was die Wiedereinrichtung von chinesischen Zollstationen betrifft, die ausserhalb des an Deutschland verpachteten Gebiets, aber innerhalb der vereinbarten Zone von 50 Kilometern, früher bestanden haben, so beabsichtigt die Kaiserlich Deutsche Regierung sich über die allendliche Regelung der Zollgrenze und der Zollvereinnahmung in einer alle Interessen China's wahrenden Weise mit der Chinesischen Regierung zu verständigen und behält sich vor hierüber in weitere Verhandlungen einzutreten.

II. Theil.—Eisenbahn- und Bergwerks-Konzessionen.

ARTIKEL I

Die Kaiserlich Chinesische Regierung gewährt Deutschland die Konzession für folgende Bahnlinien in der Provinz Shantung:

1. Von Kiaotschau über Weihsien, Chingchou, Poshan, Tzechuan und Tsouping nach Tsinanfu und von dort in der Richtung nach der Grenze von Shantung,
2. Von Kiaotschau nach Ichoufu und von dort weiter durch Laiwuhsien nach Tsinanfu.

Was den Bau der Strecke von Tsinanfu nach der Grenze von Shantung betrifft, so soll derselbe erst nach Fertigstellung der Bahn bis Tsinanfu in Angriff genommen werden, um den Anschluss derselben an die von China selber zu bauende Bahnlinie in Erwägung zu ziehen; der über die Einzelbestimmungen für das ganze Unternehmen noch zu vereinbarende besondere Vertrag soll auch die Route für diese letztere Strecke bestimmen.

ARTIKEL II

Für den Bau der genannten Bahnlinien sollen eine oder mehrere deutsch-chinesische Eisenbahngesellschaften gebildet werden. Deutsche und chinesische Kaufleute können das Aktienkapital hierfür aufbringen, und von beiden Seiten wird man zuverlässige Beamte ernennen, die das Unternehmen überwachen.

ARTIKEL III

Zur Regelung der Einzelheiten wird von beiden hohen Kontrahenten demnächst noch ein besonderer Vertrag aufgesetzt werden. China und Deutschland werden hierbei die Angelegenheit für sich regeln, jedoch verpflichtet sich die Chinesische Regierung hierbei der [den] zu bildenden deutsch-chinesischen Eisenbahn-Gesellschaft [en] günstige Bedingungen für den Bau und den Betrieb der bezeichneten Bahnen derart zu gewähren, das dieselbe[n] in allen wirthschaftlichen Fragen nicht schlechter gestellt sein wird [werden] als andere chinesisch-europäische Gesellschaften anderswo im Chinesischen Reiche. Diese Bestimmung bezieht sich nur auf wirthschaftliche Dinge und hat keinerlei andere Bedeutung. Irgend ein Gebietstheil der Provinz Shantung darf bei dem Bau der Bahnlinien nicht annektirt oder okkupirt werden.

ARTIKEL IV

An den genannten Bahnlinien entlang, in einem Abstande von 30 *Li* von den Linien, wie besonders in Poshan und Weihsien an der Linie Kiaotschau-Tsinanfu, sowie in Ichoufu und in Laiwuhsien an der Linie Kiaotschau-Ichoufu-Tsinanfu, wird deutschen Unternehmern die Ausbeutung von Kohlenlagern und sonstige Unternehmungen sowie die Ausführung der nothwendigen öffentlichen Arbeiten gestattet. Dabei können deutsche und

The Chinese people residing in the leased territory, assuming that they demean themselves in conformity with the laws and the public order, shall participate at all times in the protection of the German Government. So far as their lands are not included in plans for public improvements, they shall be at liberty to remain upon them.

If parcels of real estate owned by Chinese shall be included in plans for public improvements, the owner shall be indemnified for them.

As respects the reorganization of the Chinese customs-stations which, as formerly situated, were outside the leased territory of Germany, but within the community-zone of fifty kilometres, the Imperial German Government intends to enter into an amicable understanding with the Chinese Government in regard to the determinate regulation of the customs boundary and the collection of customs, in a manner which will protect all the interests of China; and it binds itself to enter into further negotiations on this subject.

Part II—Railroad and Mining Concessions.

ARTICLE I

The Imperial Chinese Government grants to Germany the concession for the following lines of railroad in the Province of Shantung:

1. From Kiaochow by way of Weihsien, Chingchou, Poshan, Tzechuan, and Tsouping to Tsinanfu and from thence in a straight line to the boundary of Shantung;
2. From Kiaochow to Ichoufu and from thence onwards through Laiwuhsien to Tsinanfu.

It is understood that the building of the section from Tsinanfu to the boundary of Shantung shall not be entered upon until after the completion of the road to Tsinanfu, in order that an opportunity may be given for considering the connection of this line with the line to be built by China itself. The special agreement to be made after consultation, in regard to the details of all the undertakings, shall determine the route for this last section.

ARTICLE II

For the building of the above-named lines of railroad, one or more German-Chinese railroad-companies shall be formed. German and Chinese merchants shall be at liberty to contribute capital therefor, and on both sides there shall be named trustworthy officials to supervise these undertakings.

ARTICLE III

For the regulation of the details a special agreement will be drawn up by the high contracting parties. China and Germany will regulate the matter for themselves: nevertheless the Chinese Government hereby obligates itself to the German-Chinese railroad companies which are to build the railroads, to concede fair terms for the building and operation of the designated railroads, so that in all economic questions they shall not be placed in a worse position than other Chinese-European companies elsewhere in the Chinese Empire. This provision has reference only to economic matters. No part whatsoever of the Province of Shantung can be annexed or occupied by the building of the railroad lines.

ARTICLE IV

Along the railroads above named within a space of thirty *li* from the lines, especially in Poshan and Weihsien on the Kiaochow-Tsinanfu line, and also in Ichoufu, and Laiwuhsien on the Kiaochow-Ichoufu-Tsinanfu line, it shall be permissible for German contractors to work the coal-beds, and carry on other undertakings, and also to carry into execution the plans for necessary public works. As respects these undertakings German and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chinesische Kaufleute gemeinsam Kapitalien in den Unternehmungen anlegen. Ebenso wie für die Eisenbahnkonzessionen werden auch die auf den Betrieb von Bergwerken bezüglichen Bestimmungen noch besonders vereinbart werden. Die Chinesische Regierung verspricht hierbei, den deutschen Kaufleuten und Ingenieuren in Übereinstimmung mit der in Bezug auf Eisenbahnen übernommenen Verpflichtung günstige Bedingungen derart zu gewähren, dass die deutschen Unternehmer nicht schlechter gestellt sein werden, als andere chinesisch-europäische Gesellschaften anderswo im Chinesischen Reiche. Auch diese Bestimmung bezieht sich nur auf wirthschaftliche Dinge und hat keinerlei andere Bedeutung.

III. Theil.—Prioritätsrechte in der Provinz Shantung.

Die Kaiserlich Chinesische Regierung verpflichtet sich in allen Fällen, wo zu irgendwelchen Zwecken innerhalb der Provinz Shantung fremdländische Hülfe an Personen, an Kapital oder Material in Anspruch genommen werden soll, die betreffenden Arbeiten und Materiallieferungen zunächst deutschen Industriellen und Handeltreibenden, welche sich mit dergleichen Sachen befassen, anzubieten.

Falls die deutschen Industriellen und Handeltreibenden nicht geneigt sind, die Ausführung solcher Arbeiten oder die Lieferung von Materialien zu übernehmen, so soll China nach Belieben anders verfahren können.

Die vorstehenden Abmachungen sollen von den Souveränen beider vertragschliessenden Staaten ratifizirt, und die Ratifications-Urkunden sollen derart ausgetauscht werden, dass nach Eingang der chinesischerseits ratifizirten Vertrags-Urkunde in Berlin die deutscherseits ratifizirte Urkunde dem Chinesischen Gesandten in Berlin ausgehändigt werden wird.

Der vorstehende Vertrag ist in vier Ausfertigungen—zwei deutschen und zwei chinesischen—aufgesetzt und am sechsten März ein tausend achthundert acht und neunzig gleich dem vierzehnten Tage des zweiten Mondes im vier und zwanzigsten Jahre KUANG-HSU von den Vertretern der beiden vertragschliessenden Staaten unterzeichnet worden.

Der Kaiserlich Deutsche Gesandte,
(Gez.) FREIHERR VON HEYKING.

Kaiserlich Chinesischer Grosssekretär,
Minister des Tsungli Yamen,
etc. etc. etc.,
(Gez.) LI HUNG-CHANG.

Kaiserlich Chinesischer Grosssekretär,
Mitglied des Staatsrathes,
Minister des Tsungli Yamen,
etc. etc. etc.,
(Gez.) WENG T'UNG-HO

Chinese merchants shall be at liberty to associate themselves in the furnishing of the capital. As in the case of the railroad concessions, so also as respects the working of mines, appropriate special arrangements will be agreed upon after mutual consultation. The Chinese Government hereby promises to concede to the German merchants and engineers fair terms in all respects, in harmony with the arrangements above mentioned undertaken by it in reference to railroads, so that the German contractors shall not be placed in a worse position than other Chinese-European companies elsewhere in the Chinese Empire. Moreover, this provision has reference only to economic matters, and has no other meaning.

Part III—Priority Rights in the Province of Shantung.

The Imperial Chinese Government obligates itself, in all cases in which for any purposes whatsoever within the Province of Shantung, the asking of foreign aid in persons, capital, or material shall be under consideration, to tender the public works and the supplying of materials to which the plans relate, for a first bid, to German industrial-development-engineers and material-supply-merchants who are engaged in similar undertakings.

In case the German industrial-development-engineers and material-supply-merchants are not inclined to undertake the carrying out of such works or the supplying of the materials, China shall be at liberty to proceed in any other manner at its pleasure.

The foregoing arrangements shall be ratified by the Sovereigns of the two States which are the makers of this agreement, and the instruments of ratification shall be so exchanged that upon the receipt in Berlin of the instrument of ratification on the part of China, the instrument of ratification on the part of Germany shall be handed to the Chinese Minister in Berlin.

The foregoing agreement is drawn up in four originals—two German and two Chinese: and on the sixth of March, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, equivalent to the fourteenth day of the second moon in the twenty-fourth year of Kuang-hsü, it was signed by the representatives of the two States which are the makers of the agreement.

The Imperial German Minister,
(Signed) BARON VON HEYKING.

The Imperial Chinese Chief Secretary,
Minister of the Tsungli-Yamên,
etc., etc., etc.
(Signed) LI HUNG-CHANG.

The Imperial Chinese Chief Secretary,
Member of the Council of State,
Minister of the Tsungli-Yamên,
etc., etc., etc.
(Signed) WENG T'UNG-HO.

The Shantung Award to Japan

By THOMAS F. MILLARD

Extent of Cession to Japan.

THE territorial extent of the "concession" on Kiaochow Bay made to Germany originally by China, under duress, is about 200 square miles. Kiaochow is the name of the district and of the bay. Tsingtao is the name of a town and port that was built by Germany within the territorial "leasehold." By the Paris Treaty, Japan obtains the reversion of the German leasehold of Kiaochow, and also whatever mining and other industrial enterprises in Shantung Province in which Germans were interested.

The extent in mileage of this Japanese foothold in Shantung gives no correct idea of its true compass. The permanent "settlement concession" ceded to Japan by the Treaty, at Tsingtao, includes the entire port facilities there, the entire railway terminals, and the greater and more important part of the business portion of the town. Coupled with Japanese possession and policing of the Tsingtao-Tsinan railway over its entire length, penetrating the center of the Province of Shantung, this gives Japan complete economic and political control of the province. The American economic and political experts attached to the American Commission at Paris gave their opinions to this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effect in writing, after an exhaustive study of the conditions and facts.

American naval and military experts have also given their opinions that Japan's control of Tsingtao, the port and the railway, affects in a serious degree China's defensive security, and also affects adversely the general strategical position of the United States towards the Asiatic question.

Comparison with Previous Foreign Settlements in China.

In attempting to explain the permanent acquisition by Japan (ninety-nine-year lease) of a permanent concession at Tsingtao, a comparison is made with existing foreign residential settlements at Shanghai, Tientsin, Hankow, Canton, and other treaty ports in China. This comparison is completely inexact. Those residential settlements are administered under treaty provisions, and all nationalities have equal facilities and rights under the "most favored nation" clauses of treaties with China; while at every place in China where Japan has obtained an exclusive concession she has used that position to give Japanese special political, legal, and commercial advantages not only over other foreigners, but also over the Chinese residents. The files of the State and Commerce Departments of the United States Government are gorged with reports proving this. Yet, in granting to Japan a special position at Tsingtao, no care apparently was taken to obtain guarantees for equal international position and treatment there.

The Chinese delegation at the Peace Conference proposed, as an alternative to giving Japan an exclusive concession at Tsingtao, that the town be made an international settlement until a time should arrive when China might ask to be relieved of all such settlements. This proposal was refused by Japan.

Japanese propaganda in America uses the argument that Japan was forced to demand what she did regarding Tsingtao because of the exactions that other powers have in the past made upon China. Had Japan been really actuated by this motive, she would have supported China at the Peace Conference in asking that the Peace Conference affirm the principle of a restoration to China of all such "concessions" and "leaseholds," and Japan might have herself set the example by voluntarily and immediately restoring Shantung to China, thus making it embarrassing for other powers not to act likewise.

Japanese settlements and residential concessions previously existing in various treaty ports in China, and in Manchuria, have become notorious as the centers of vice and undesirable elements and conditions. They are the clearing-houses for many kinds of illicit and illegal acts, like the smuggling of opium and other injurious narcotics into China, the wholesale introduction of Japanese female prostitutes, and the sale in dives, under Japanese consular protection, of alchoholic liquors made in Japan and sold under established foreign trade-marks. These conditions are notorious, and have caused numerous disorders in China, and at times serious clashes between Japanese and other foreigners. As a result of a clash attended with fatalities between American soldiers and Japanese at Tientsin, it was necessary to issue orders for American troops not to enter the Japanese settlement. The municipal police records of the foreign settlements of Shanghai contain ample evidence of the results of Japanese consular and court jurisdiction there. The details and facts of these conditions no doubt exist in consular reports in the State Department.

Comparisons with the Monroe Doctrine.

The comparison of Japan's policy towards China with the Monroe Doctrine is absolutely false. Japan's Chinese policy is the complete antithesis of the Monroe Doctrine, as an analysis of the facts will show. On the other hand, the so-called Hay Doctrine, with its principles of the "open door" for commercial opportunity, and protection of China's territorial integrity and political autonomy, is an almost exact analogy with the Monroe Doctrine.

Japan and the War.

According to the press an explanation, emanating from the White House, has been given, to the effect that Japan entered the war at the urgent request of Great Britain, under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and that in order to induce Japan to come in then, Great Britain promised that Japan would receive the German rights in Shantung. That statement is completely inexact. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance did not require Japan to enter this war; and in a speech made at Boston, on July 4, 1918, Viscount Ishii expressly stated that Japan did not enter the war because of obligations under the alliance with Great Britain. On the contrary, all the known facts indicate that the British Government did not want Japan to enter the war when she did.

Japan entered the war in August, 1914. The secret agreements by which the British, French, Russian, and Italian Governments consented to allow Japan to have the German rights in Shantung were made in February and March, 1917, two and one-half years after Japan entered the war. Those secret agreements were obtained by Japan, pressing her allies at the darkest moment of the war, in the winter of 1917, and many facts now known indicate plainly that Japan obtained those agreements by virtually threatening to treat with Germany, In other words Japan secured the secret Shantung agreements by blackmailing her allies.

Except in taking Tsingtao from Germany (an easy task) Japan never gave any help to the Allies in the war. Even ships supplied to the United States to rush American reinforcements to Europe were in most cases unseaworthy and unsuitable for the purpose. Every time it was proposed that Japan should supply some forces in Europe, Japan either made excuses, or demanded compensations which the Allies could not grant. On the other hand, China, even as a neutral, supplied some two hundred thousand laborers, thousands of whom died in Europe in the performance of duty. On several occasions these Chinese laborers took part in holding the Allied positions in the stress of severe German attacks. China, after she entered the war, proffered to send troops to Europe, but was not given the financial and other assistance required to enable her to do so, and moreover China was obstructed in such efforts by Japan.

Diplomatic Position and Responsibility of the United States

China entered the war principally because of the advice and urging of the United States. Therefore, the reported statement attributed to the President, that he takes responsibility for the Shantung settlement in the Treaty, converts what was a presumed compulsion under strong political and psychological pressure into what amounts to a flagrant tergiversation that touches the diplomatic honor of America. Unless something is done to disassociate the United States from the Shantung settlement of the Paris Treaty, the Chinese people of the present generation, and perhaps for many generations hereafter, will regard America and Americans with suspicion, aversion, and contempt. It is obvious, also, that the effects of this kind of American diplomacy, when the facts are known, will react upon American diplomatic and national prestige over the entire world.

Ten Questions on Shantung.

1. If Japan really wanted to "protect" China from foreign aggressions, under a thesis similar to the Monroe Doctrine, why did not the Japanese envoys at Paris support China's plea that a clause be inserted in the Treaty, or the Covenant of the League of Nations by which *all the Powers* would renounce their special concessions and "spheres of interest" in China?

2. If Japan means to keep her oft-repeated promises to evacuate Shantung Province and to restore Tsingtao to China, why did she refuse at Paris to put this purpose plainly in the Treaty?

3. If Japan claims that the special concession which she is to retain permanently at Tsingtao is comparable and similar to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long-established foreign settlements in the treaty ports of China, which really are international in character, and that Japan wants and will get no "preferential" position in Shantung, why did she object at Paris to China's offer to make Tsingtao an international port for the time that other foreign settlements continue to exist in China?

4. If the Great Powers which, under the present draft of the Covenant, will control the League of Nations, really meant and intended that China's rights and interests should be protected by the League, why did the Council of Four, by M. Clemenceau, refuse China's offer to sign the Treaty provided the Council of Four would guarantee that the League of Nations would hear China's case?

5. Why does Japan object to giving a promise in writing, or a written stipulation, as to her intentions concerning Shantung? All the other nations wrote their obligations into the Treaty.

6. At the time when the Lansing-Ishii agreement was negotiated at Washington, in the autumn of 1917, did Viscount Ishii inform Mr. Lansing or President Wilson of the existence of the secret agreements between Japan and the Governments of Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy, by which those Governments had agreed to support Japan's claims in Shantung?

7. If Viscount Ishii did so inform either or both, will not the possession of that knowledge by the American Government have hereafter a marked bearing in favor of the Japanese "interpretation" of the Lansing-Ishii agreement?

8. If Viscount Ishii did not at that time inform the American Government of the existence of those agreements, signed in February and March, 1917, was it not questionable diplomatic trickery on the part of Japan, amounting to deception?

9. Does not the acceptance by the American Government, at the Peace Conference, of those secret agreements relating to Shantung, taken in conjunction with all the previous circumstances and conditions, bear strongly in favor of the Japanese "interpretations" of the Lansing-Ishii agreement?

10. What is the official American interpretation of the Lansing-Ishii agreement?

Extracts from a Correspondence

THE following extracts are from letters exchanged between Mr. Thomas F. Millard and Mr. David Jayne Hill concerning the Shantung Award.

July 5, 1919

. . . We know now (as was disclosed for the first time to the American and Chinese Governments in a meeting of the Council of Ten at Paris last February), that in February and March, 1917, at the very time when our Government was inducing China to break with Germany, the British, French, Russian, and Italian Governments, without informing either the American or Chinese Governments, entered into secret agreements with Japan by which China's rights were traded off, and by which the diplomatic assurances given by our Government to China were stultified. In the vernacular, that action by Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy amounted to giving America and China the "double-cross." Yet President Wilson at Paris permitted those secret agreements to overrule our obligations to China, and the political principles for which we were presumed to have entered the war.

Second: It is practically certain that a private agreement (made at a meeting of Balfour, Pichon, and Makino last March in Paris) was reached whereby the British, French, and Japanese Governments would support each other in the Conference in all questions relating to Asia, and would jointly support Japan's claims in Shantung. That private understanding, I am reliably informed, was reached before the revision of the Covenant of the League of Nations, with the Monroe Doctrine clause (Article XXI) by which the Monroe Doctrine is defined as a "regional understanding," and existing and subsequent "regional understandings" among the nations that are members of the League are made valid. So it appears that certain powers (our allies, so called), first made a private agreement among themselves about a future status and balance of power in Asia, then wrote provisions into the Treaty and the Covenant to make such a status hold.

. . . I was present when the President's explanation of his action in that matter was semi-officially communicated to the Chinese delegation in Paris, in which the President explained that political exigency (the threat of Japan to bolt the conference, and the private intimation that the British government might, in that event, have to withdraw too) had forced him to assent to the Shantung decision in order to save the League of Nations, and that he would see that China would get justice from the League.

To this, one of the Chinese delegates replied: First, that the League of Nations as yet has no existence; secondly, that if it is born its powers and authority will be problematical; thirdly, that in any event its real ruling force will be the same Governments that made the decision at Paris in the Shantung Question and wrote the terms of the Treaty and Covenant; fourthly, it cannot be presumed either in law or logic that a League of Nations whose constitution is created in association with the Treaty, and by the same body, is designed to reverse or to amend the terms of the Treaty; fifthly, that it is only the weak nations that are forced to depend on the League of Nations for justice, security and protection, while the Powers themselves positively refuse to depend on those guarantees, and state openly that they are inadequate. . . .

As an international student and lawyer, I ask your opinion on some questions. If our nation ratifies the Treaty and Covenant as they stand, without reservations, and it transpires subsequently that a tri-Power "regional understanding" regarding Asia as outlined in my memorandum has been made by Japan, Great Britain, and France (in this connection, the Anglo-Japan alliances, and the Franco-Japan agreements already in existence have a bearing), how will it be feasible for our nation, or China, or any small Asiatic nationality, to overrule such a combination of powers, which under the Covenant will constitute, with their satellites, a majority of both the Council and Assembly of the League?

In view of the fact that, at Paris, the British, French, and Italian Governments insisted that the existence of private agreements among powers took precedence and must control acts and policies of those powers in matters covered by the private regional agreements, and in view of the further fact that such private regional agreements are specifically recognized and legalized by the Covenant of the League, how will it be possible to plead before the Council or Assembly of the League that such private agreements are invalid?

In view of the above, and in view of the known practical methods of world politics, what reason is there to believe or to expect that, subsequently, the British, French, Japanese, and Italian Governments will be more yielding in these matters than they were at Paris? . . .

THOMAS F. MILLARD

July 10, 1919

. . . What you say regarding the expression "regional understandings" in Article XXI of the Covenant, is of supreme consequence. It enables us to comprehend the reason for the strange phraseology used in connection with the Monroe Doctrine, to which it does not really apply, while it completely covers the secret agreements to which you refer. The provision of Article XX does not require the abrogation of these "regional understandings"; for, by the exceptions made in Article XXI, they are not to be regarded as "inconsistent with the terms of the Covenant." On the contrary, Article XXI expressly validates them. . . .

DAVID JAYNE HILL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED